

law subjecting food and dairy products to the laws of the State or Territory into which they are imported—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Resolutions of Board of Trade, common council, and the Lumberman's Association, all of North Tonawanda, N. Y., protesting against the passage of House bill No. 2994, authorizing the construction of a dam at the head of the Niagara River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WEEKS: Petition of Joseph Schaubert and other druggists, of Mount Clemens, Mich., relating to the stamp tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany House bill relating to the regulation of wages for labor in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Papers to accompany House bill relating to the citizenship of Choctaw Indians in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Resolutions of Susquehanna County, Pa., Medical Society, favoring legislation to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to scientifically investigate and classify native drug plants—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petition and papers of the Armour Packing Company, in relation to the tax on oleomargarine and butterine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, letter of the secretary of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, in relation to the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Kansas City, Mo., Live Stock Exchange, against increasing the tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. K. Mulford Company and the Allison Manufacturing Company, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill No. 887, for the promotion of exhibits in the Philadelphia museums—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Joseph J. Meany & Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the ratification of the reciprocity treaty with France—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Boston Merchants' Association, Boston, Mass., for competing cable facilities between the United States and Cuba, etc.—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, letter of M. B. Mahnrin, of Indianapolis, Ind., in relation to monetary and banking systems, rates of interest, and taxes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 15, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. NELSON, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 7th instant, a report of the Auditor for the War Department relative to the account between the United States and the State of South Carolina growing out of the claim for moneys expended by that State for military purposes in the Florida war of 1836 and 1837; which, on motion of Mr. TILLMAN, was, with the accompanying papers, ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

GETTYSBURG NATIONAL PARK.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 22d ultimo, a report of the Gettysburg National Park Commission relative to the acquisition of lands in the vicinity of Gettysburg not exceeding in area the parcels of land shown on the map prepared by Maj. Gen. Daniel E. Sickles, now on file in the office of the Secretary of War, which were occupied by the infantry, cavalry, and artillery on the 1st, 2d, and 3d days of July, 1863, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Commercial Club, of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Minnesota State Veterinary

Medical Association, praying for the establishment of an Army veterinary corps; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented memorials of Local Union No. 74, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Poughkeepsie, of Local Union No. 311, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Auburn, and of Local Union No. 81, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Peekskill, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the admission of cigars free of duty from the Philippines, Puerto Rico, Cuba, or any other territory; which were referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 74, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and a petition of Local Union No. 57, Metal Polishers, Buffers, and Brass Workers, of Elmira, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to limit the hours of daily service of laborers, etc., upon public works or works done for the United States, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of D. M. Osborne & Co., of Auburn; Wadsworth's Sons, of Auburn; the Wegman Piano Company, of Auburn; H. A. Mayer, of Syracuse; the Frontenac Manufacturing Company, of Syracuse; Meyer & Co., of Thompsonville; the Merritt Manufacturing Company, of Lockport; Miller & Van Winkle, of Brooklyn; the National Lead Company, of New York City; Richardson & Boynton, of New York City; the Vose & Cliff Manufacturing Company, of New York City; Masury & Son, of New York City; the Roessler & Hasslacher Chemical Company, of New York City; C. H. Childs & Co., of Utica; F. Linke & Co., of New York City; the Standard Harrow Company, of Utica, and the Savage Arms Company, of Utica, all in the State of New York, praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a new fireproof Patent Office building; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Terre Haute, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Thomas H. Boyd & Co., and sundry other druggists of Laporte, Ind., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Dodge Manufacturing Company, of Mishawaka, Ind., and a petition of M. Rumely & Co., of Laporte, Ind., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a new fireproof Patent Office building; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. SIMON. I present a petition of the Columbia River Fishermen's Protective Union, of Astoria, Oreg., praying that all the remaining public lands of the United States be held for the benefit of the whole people and that no grants of the title to any of these lands be made to any but actual settlers and home builders on the land. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASTORIA, OREG., February 7, 1900.

To the Congress of the United States:

Whereas one-third of the entire area of the United States, exclusive of Alaska, is comprised within the domain and still belongs to the people; and Whereas the reclamation and settlement of this vast territory would give employment and a chance to get a home on the land to a multitude of American workers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Columbia River Fishermen's Protective Union, First, that all the remaining public lands of the United States should be sacredly held for the benefit of the whole people, and that no grants of the title to any of these lands should ever hereafter be made to any but actual settlers and home builders on the land;

Second, that the public grazing lands should be leased in limited areas to settlers on adjacent lands, title to remain in the Federal Government until actual settlement, and the revenues from rentals to go to the States to be used for the reclamation of the irrigable arid lands;

Third, that the Federal Government should build storage reservoirs to save the flood waters that now are wasted, and should wherever necessary build the irrigation works required for the reclamation and settlement of the arid public lands; and

Whereas the foregoing policy is advocated by the National Irrigation Association, as embodied in its constitution, and the object of said association is to bring about its adoption by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Further resolved, That we believe it would be enormously beneficial to the interests of labor that said policy should be adopted, and that all labor organizations should cooperate with the National Irrigation Association to accomplish this result.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of the directors of the Latin-American Club and Foreign Trade Association, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to enable competing cable companies to lay and operate submarine cables from the United States to Cuba; which was referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

He also presented a petition of sundry members of the Missouri State Militia, praying that they be granted pensions the same as

the regulars and volunteers of the United States Army; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS. I present a joint resolution of the legislature of California, relative to the survey of public lands in that State. I ask that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Assembly joint resolution No. 5. Introduced by Mr. Knowland, February 8, 1900. Referred to the committee on Federal relations.]

Assembly joint resolution No. 5. Relative to the survey of public lands in California.

Whereas from the report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office it appears that during the year ended June 30, 1899, there were added to the surveyed area of public lands in this State no more than 8,387 acres, while the amount so added to such areas in other States was vastly more, and nearly 2,000,000 acres in one State; and

Whereas it is important for the welfare and development of California that the public surveys here should be pushed as rapidly toward completion as they are in other States, in order that our settlers on new lands can obtain their titles with the same facility as elsewhere; and

Whereas it is unjust that settlers in California should be less favored than in other States:

Resolved by the senate of the State of California and the assembly jointly, That our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives be requested to urge the completion of the public surveys in this State and prompt filing of plats in the local land offices, to the end that the public lands be made available for settlement and improvement.

Mr. PERKINS. I present a joint resolution of the legislature of California, relative to Government lands containing petroleum, asphaltum, and other valuable minerals in paying quantities. I ask that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Assembly joint resolution No. 3. Introduced by Mr. Dale February 8, 1900. Amended in assembly February 9, 1900.]

Assembly joint resolution No. 3. Relative to Government lands containing petroleum, asphaltum, and other valuable minerals in paying quantities.

Whereas many thousands of acres of lands bearing petroleum, asphaltum, and other valuable minerals in paying quantities, situate in Kern, Fresno, and other counties of the State of California, have been returned by the United States surveyor-general as agricultural lands; and

Whereas said lands are now being developed for the minerals they contain, and are producing, and will continue to produce, millions of dollars of wealth in such minerals, and thus building up an industry of immeasurable worth to the State of California; and

Whereas certain persons are now attempting to acquire title to said lands as agricultural State lands under an act authorizing the State of California to take Government lands in exchange for State school lands under an act passed in February, 1891, and "relating to lien lands to be selected by State or Territory," and also in exchange for forest-reservation lands under an act of June 4, 1897; and

Whereas the sole purpose of such persons in acquiring said lands for speculation, because of their value for oil and other minerals and not for development purposes, thus retarding the growth of one of the most important industries in California, thwarting the will of the people and the intent of our National Congress in granting certain rights to the locator of mining claims, and depriving thousands of miners of their holdings, the title to which has hitherto been held by the United States Government to be valid: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That our Senators be instructed and our Representatives be requested to use all honorable means to prevent the frauds which seem to be practiced upon the miners in this State by securing the passage of such laws by the National Congress as will preclude the use of what is known as forest reservation land scrip to acquire title to these well-known mineral lands. Be it

Further resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be instructed to forthwith transmit by mail a copy hereof to our Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California.

Mr. PERKINS. I present a joint resolution of the legislature of California relative to the report of the California Débris Commission. I ask that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Assembly joint resolution No. 4. Introduced by Mr. Caminetti, February 8, 1900. Made special order February 9, 1900.]

Assembly joint resolution No. 4, relating to the report of the California Débris Commission.

Whereas the California Débris Commission has, in the report concerning debris dams and restraining works recently submitted to the Secretary of War, recommended a system which is claimed to be safe, practicable, and economical; and

Whereas, in order to secure the inauguration and construction thereof, the appropriations recommended by said commission should be made without delay: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That our Senators be instructed and our Representatives in Congress be requested to urge the approval of said report and the publication thereof, and to use all honorable means to secure the appropriations required to put into execution the plans recommended therein. Be it

Further resolved, That a copy of this resolution, duly attested, be transmitted to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of California.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Labor Council of San Francisco, Cal., praying that all the remaining public lands of the United States be held for the benefit of the whole people, and that no grants of the title of these lands shall ever hereafter be made to any but actual settlers and home builders on the land; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a memorial of the Labor Council of San Francisco, Cal., remonstrating against the passage of House bill No. 5067, concerning the boarding of vessels; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McBRIDE presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Portland, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of Local Union No. 154, Cigar Makers' International Union of America, of Lincoln, Ill., remonstrating against the cession of public lands to the several States; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. LINDSAY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kentucky, praying for the establishment of an army veterinary corps; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FORAKER presented a memorial of the medical societies of Miami and Shelby counties, Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DANIEL presented a petition of the Business Men's Association of Hampton, Va., praying that an appropriation be made to continue the work of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Iowa Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution permitting the women of the United States to vote; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

THE PACIFIC CABLE.

Mr. HALE. I present a number of communications from representatives of certain cable companies in the United States, relating to the construction of a Pacific cable. I move that all the communications be printed as one document and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom the subject was referred, submitted a report, accompanied by a bill (S. 3176) to provide for the erection of dwellings for the keepers of the Grosse Isle, Mich., light-houses; which was read twice by its title.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 152) to provide for the erection of a house for the keeper of the Grosse Isle, Mich., light-house, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 153) to establish wind-signal display stations at South Manitou Island, Lake Michigan, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1928) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of telegraphic cables between the United States of America and Hawaii, Guam, and the Philippine Islands, and other countries, and to promote commerce, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs; which was agreed to.

Mr. PROCTOR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2788) for the relief of Wells C. McCool, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2199) for the relief of volunteer officers and soldiers who served in the Philippine Islands beyond the period of their enlistment, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 28) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James H. Waters, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SEWELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 99) to establish a military post at or near Des Moines, Iowa, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 430) for the relief of Charles Wagemann, submitted an adverse report thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2883) to change the characteristic of Cape Cod light, Massachusetts, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 257) for the relief of Gilman Sawtelle, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1882) for the relief of Francis S. Davidson, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4473) to authorize the Natchitoches Railway and Construction Company to build and maintain a railway and traffic bridge across Red River at Grand Ecore, in the parish of Natchitoches, State of Louisiana, reported it with an amendment.

REPORT ON COPPER RIVER EXPLORATION EXPEDITION.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. ELKINS, January 23, 1900, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed 5,000 copies of the report of Capt. W. R. Abercrombie on the Copper River exploration expedition to Alaska, transmitted by the Secretary of War, of which 1,500 shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,500 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,000 for distribution by the War Department.

COMPILATION RELATIVE TO THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. LODGE. In accordance with Senate resolution No. 44, passed January 9, I report from the Committee on the Philippines a brief compilation of the latest information and statistics obtainable on the numbers, areas, population, races and tribes, agriculture, exports and imports, forests, and harbors of the Philippine Islands. I move that the usual number of the report be printed for the use of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

QUARTERMASTERS' SUPPLIES FOR THE ARMY, ETC.

Mr. SEWELL. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6267) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act to suspend the operation of certain provisions of law relating to the War Department, and for other purposes," to report it without amendment. I will state that these are provisions of law restrictive in their nature under which no war could be carried on. In advertising for the purchase of so many horses, mules, etc, the Department find it is an absolute necessity that the privilege shall be extended, which expires at the end of this fiscal year. It is proposed to extend it for one year, so as to continue during the next fiscal year. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read in full for information.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. HALE. This is a very important bill and there are very important provisions in it. I should like to have an opportunity of examining it as it deals with the Army and its future. I do not want to object, although I shall have to do so, if necessary. I ask the Senator to let it stand over until to-morrow.

Mr. SEWELL. I will say that it is the provision of law now. The provisions of the old law were suspended. The old law provided for an army of 20,000, and in advertising in relation to the number of horses and things of that kind, we could not carry on a war without suspending those provisions. The Secretary of War asks that the time be extended for another year.

Mr. HALE. I will examine it.

Mr. SEWELL. We could not go on after the first of the month if those provisions were not extended.

Mr. HALE. I will examine it between now and to-morrow morning. I should like to have an opportunity to examine it. We ought to be very careful about legislation respecting the Army.

Mr. HAWLEY. If the Senator will pardon me, I will state that this is nothing but a renewal of the act which we passed a year ago, which was very carefully studied in all its details. It is merely to facilitate the transaction of business in some bureaus of the War Department.

Mr. HALE. I understand that, but it is not asking very much that the bill shall go over for a day in order that Senators may examine it.

Mr. SEWELL. Is the Senator aware that it is a House bill also and that the measure went through the House?

Mr. HALE. I have a copy of it here before me. But it does not follow that it should be passed when reported because the House has passed the bill. A great many bills we put through by unanimous consent when they are reported; bills that are not of special importance; but it is not in the line of good legislation that important bills should be put through in this way. When the bulk of bills which are of a private nature have been considered by a

committee, we take the say so of the committee, and we sometimes pass them when reported; but important bills, bills affecting large interests, and especially affecting the Army and the Navy, ought not to be passed without giving Senators an opportunity to examine them; and it ought not to be considered intrusive in this body because a Senator asks that a bill may go over for a day in order that he may examine it.

Mr. SEWELL. I would not object to the extension of time for the consideration of the bill except that it is absolutely necessary that this bill shall be passed within a day or two. For instance, there is one provision of law that prohibits the Quartermaster's Department from paying more than \$150 a month for anybody's services. We never contemplated then that we would have a lot of transports and probably would have to pay \$250 or \$350 a month for first-class officers.

Mr. ALDRICH. I feel constrained to object to the further consideration of the bill at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill goes to the Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 3177) for the relief of the persons who sustained damage by the explosion of an ammunition chest of Battery F, Second United States Artillery, July 16, 1894; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3178) for the relief of Sarah Friedman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3179) for the relief of Benjamin F. Fox; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3180) granting an increase of pension to Horace H. Redford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 3181) to amend the act relating to the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 3182) to incorporate the Wesley Heights Railway Company, of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 3183) granting a pension to George W. Newell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3184) granting a pension to James R. Alfrey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3185) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frederick Heer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. KENNEY introduced a bill (S. 3186) granting a pension to Margaretha Lippert; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 3187) for the relief of the estate of Jesse Mabry, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 3188) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Walker; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3189) for the relief of Leonard I. Brownson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 3190) to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 3191) for the relief of the estate of James Young; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3192) to provide for the erection of a public building at Jersey City, N. J.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 3193) granting a pension to Charles H. Force; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 3194) granting an increase of pension to William Kepler; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DANIEL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3195) for the relief of the estate of Sarah G. Smith, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3196) for the relief of the heirs at

law of Maj. Tarleton Woodson, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3197) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Portsmouth, in the State of Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. KENNEY introduced a bill (S. 3198) granting an increase of pension to Fisher Ames; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3199) to correct the military record of William J. McNatt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 89) providing for the purchase of historical manuscripts relating to the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KYLE submitted an amendment proposing to increase the allowance for salary of consul at Beirut from \$2,000 to \$2,500 per annum, intended to be proposed by him to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURROWS submitted an amendment proposing to increase the allowance for salary of minister resident and consul-general to Siam from \$5,000 to \$7,500 per annum, intended to be proposed by him to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

LIEUT. COMMANDER R. M. G. BROWN.

Mr. TILLMAN. I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 1636) authorizing the President of the United States to nominate Lieut. Commander R. M. G. Brown, now on the retired list, to be a commander on the retired list, was indefinitely postponed, and that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

POLICY REGARDING THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Tuesday next, after the routine morning business, I shall call up the joint resolution (S. R. 45) declaring the purpose of the United States with reference to the Philippine Islands, with a view of submitting some remarks thereon.

SEIZURES IN AND NEAR DELAGOA BAY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

In response to the resolution of the Senate of January 17, 1900, I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, showing the steps that have been taken by the Department of State to obtain the restitution of property of American citizens seized and detained by the military authorities of Great Britain in and near Delagoa Bay, South Africa.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,

Washington, February 15, 1900.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. HOAR. Is the pending question on the amendment in regard to international bimetalism?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I wish not to make a speech or argument, but merely to make one very simple statement before this amendment shall be voted upon. It is almost too commonplace a thing to say in the hearing of gentlemen who have been, like the members of this body, meditating upon and discussing this important question for so many years, and yet it is a thing which seems to me to be entirely forgotten in political discussions and the discussions of the press.

Whenever there is added any action in favor of the gold standard or any recognition of the gold standard as something forced upon the people by the necessities of the case, there comes up a cry from the press of both parties, and that portion of the press which likes to style itself independent, that there is an attempt to straddle, to get silver votes, or please silver communities by mak-

ing some vague, worthless, shadowy promise of doing something for silver in the remote future.

When the Republican convention at St. Louis, which nominated President McKinley, stated their conviction that it was desirable that the consent of commercial nations should be obtained to rehabilitate silver, and pledged itself to do what could be done, and of course pledging the Republican party to promote that end, the cry went up, a half sneer and a half laugh, even in Republican papers that were strong advocates of the gold standard, that that was a sort of sop to Cerberus.

Now, the people of the country, it seems to me, ought to be reminded of what had been the uniform belief of everybody in this country down to the time when our finances got into confusion during the civil war. Alexander Hamilton and Jefferson, each in his own way, when the Constitution was inaugurated—Hamilton at the request of Congress, and Jefferson at the desire and with the full concurrence of Washington—investigated this question of currency down to its fundamental principles; and the result was the greatest report on finance made by the greatest financial genius in the history of the world who ever had any public administrative responsibility, Alexander Hamilton, a report concurred in by Jefferson and accepted for nearly a hundred years by the whole American people, by Washington and his associates, by Webster, by Benton, by Jackson, and the leaders of both parties and of both sections.

That belief established three fundamental principles: First, that the best standard of value was the double standard, gold and silver; next, that that could only be maintained by concert or co-operation or common action of the great commercial nations of the world; and third, that if it could not be maintained, gold, which is the most valuable metal, is the one to which it would be necessary to resort.

The two parties differed as to whether redeemable paper currency issued by the Government, or issued by banks with the authority of the Government, should be added to this bimetallic currency; but those three truths, as they were deemed, were accepted by the entire American people without any considerable question. They not only were accepted by the American people, but the double standard of gold and silver was recognized in the Constitution itself, prohibiting the States to make anything but gold and silver legal tender, and of course implying and taking for granted in that prohibition that Congress would not do this thing which no State should be permitted to do.

Now, then, the principal nations of the world had a substantial bimetalism. Though one metal would get a little ahead at one time, a few per cent, and another a little ahead of the other, still gold and silver circulated everywhere as legal standards of value, and the civilized world got along.

Now, when the destruction of specie payments and the disturbance of the war came on, we got our finances into confusion, and the fiat-money schemes, and the schemes of one sort and another for paying debts, Government debts and private debts, with a depreciated or cheap currency came up. Soon after the principal nations of the world, following England, which had started earlier, departed from the old, safe, accepted bimetallic path, and the condition of things which Alexander Hamilton thought possible and intimates in this report came about—that you could not get the concert of nations any longer to a double standard. We have been compelled, as a majority of us think, to follow other nations in the path in which they have led, of a single standard, and we are doing just what Hamilton and just what Jefferson thought we must do if that condition of things happened, namely, to take the most valuable metal and the metal which other civilized nations adopt as our standard.

But in doing that, when we say that the American people has not changed its mind, but that we still believe the double standard the best, we are only saying that we reaffirm the universal opinion of the American people for a hundred years. Whether it gain votes or lose votes, whether it satisfy discontented communities or do not satisfy them, it remains the simple truth, which every man in the Senate old enough to remember the time before the war, whether he was a special student of finance or only an ordinary intelligent American citizen, believes, to wit, that you must have the two metals if you can get the concert of other nations in doing it; that if you can not, if you are driven from that policy, you must accept the most valuable metal, and that you must get back to the double standard again whenever an opportunity comes, the double standard and not the single standard being the best for mankind and the best for us.

Now, that is all there is of it; and if it gain votes or please discontented communities or help the party in power, it is only gaining votes and pleasing discontented communities and helping the party in power by a reaffirmation of the simple truth and a reaffirmation of the accepted belief of the American people of all parties and of all sections for a hundred years. It is nothing new. There is no disguise in it; there is no pretense in it; there

is no hypocrisy in it; but it is the simple fact that every American citizen who formed his opinion since Hamilton made his report down to the year 1863 believed these three truths; and that is all there is of it.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, the amendment now before the Senate is one of those miserable makeshifts that force themselves into financial bills to cover the wounds of those who support them against the lacerations of conscience. When this amendment is voted on the committee's substitute for the House bill, I will offer what I will now read as a substitute for that amendment:

First. That it is the fixed policy of the United States to pay and clear off the national debt as rapidly as just and equal taxation and the accumulation of other revenues of the Government will permit, with constant regard to the capacity of the people to respond to this national duty.

Second. That the specie basis, consisting of gold or silver coin, or both, is the only true, just, and constitutional basis of the issue of bank bills to circulate as money.

Third. That it is an unjust and unconstitutional burden on the taxpayers of the United States that Congress should agree to change the terms of the national obligations, with the consent of the bondholders, so as to deprive the people of the right and privilege of paying said obligations in coins of gold or silver according to their necessities or the requirements of the general welfare.

Fourth. That it is contrary to the policy of the United States that the national debt shall be made perpetual, or that it should be maintained or increased for the benefit of the national banks, or to regulate the commercial value of gold or silver bullion.

If this substitute for the amendment of the Senate committee should be adopted, I would then move to strike out the word "enacted" in the enacting clause and substitute in place of it the word "resolved," so that it would be a joint resolution.

The ground that has been covered in the general discussion of this measure is the same that has been surveyed and resurveyed in the Senate for more than twenty years. The facts, with slight additions, and the arguments, almost without change, are the same that have been presented at every session of ten successive Congresses.

All the old battles have been fought over and all the now healing wounds have been torn open to bleed afresh.

It would be an intolerable cruelty to a people who are pushing their enterprises with renewed vigor and great prosperity in the dawn of a new era, in which the strength and splendor of the Republic is developing in concert with the noblest virtues and best aspirations of benevolence and justice, if this bitter discussion was forced upon our country for purposes of party advantage in the coming elections.

This motive has something to do with this agitation, so unwelcome to the people.

The compelling power of party organizations is the chief reliance of the projectors of this measure for its passage, and the fretful protests of some distinguished leaders of the majority against its provisions and the artful introduction of provisions that are misleading and deceptive, for the purpose of quieting others, show that the bill has impressed many of its supporters with a feeling of alarm and abhorrence.

But it moves on its course with the steadiness and ease of a cloud driven by unseen winds in a summer sky. It is well directed in its course and is resistless in its progress.

It is not dealing with ratios between the money metals or questions that relate to their equality in the mints, nor does it pause to consider the sanctity of contracts or the questions of constitutional laws and rights that obstruct its progress.

The mission of the bill is to decree a higher law than the Constitution, that shall emancipate concentrated capital from all taxation, to make capital the beneficiary of the powers of taxation which were given to Congress alone for the purpose of conducting the Government, to make the bond debt of the Government perpetual, and to increase it as occasion may offer, so that the national banks, based upon it, shall rule the financial destiny of the people forever, and to give them the power to create money that the Government is bound to redeem in gold gathered by taxation, and to regulate its volume of supply to the people.

This power to increase or diminish the volume of currency at will is the inquiry of absolutism in the hands of the money power, the most potent and relentless of all despots.

This ruling and irresponsible agency of the power of money, given into the hands of 3,500 national banks, is more dangerous to the people than if 3,500 regiments were concentrated under the command of an ambitious, selfish, and cruel despot who has no regard for any rights or interests that are not his own.

No national bank has interests that are in competition with any other national bank, and they are all so subject to the power of the Secretary of the Treasury that his will as to their operations is irresistible, and therefore his power to command them is supreme.

I am not stating the facts to support these statements. I have no need to state them. They are known to the people of the whole country. They are and have been on every page of every bank book of accounts for more than fifty years, and they are

written in the experiences of everybody who ever had an account in one of them. While it is a leading purpose of this bill to keep this enormous concentration power under the control of capital and credit engaged in manufacturing bills to circulate as money on the basis of the credit of the Government, and while this is a danger to the people that threatens all the sources of their prosperity and all their liberties, there is a still deeper purpose, not in the least concealed, to divide our people into two classes—one the bearer of national burdens and the other the untaxed holders of permanent mortgages on the labor, earnings, productions, and property of all the industrial classes.

The feudalism of Europe, that our Constitution was expressly designed to prohibit in our country, has been transferred largely in the British Isles from lands into consols, which represent the interest-bearing national debt. It is the purpose and necessary effect of this measure to establish this system of feudalism in the United States. Its success is assured, and I fear it is irrevocable, when this bill or the House bill is enacted into law.

To aid this plan in the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland by increasing the purchasing power of the interest paid on the bonds, gold was made their sole legal-tender money, and thus enhanced in value, its scarcity was safely relied upon to lower the price of the labor and property out of which the bondholders were to derive their interest.

This bill adopts gold as the sole money to be received for all taxes and to pay the bonds and the interest upon them, and returns us to the same dominion that we thought we were escaping from in 1776 as to the feudal system. We are now on a worse footing than our brethren, the British subjects, because in the United Kingdom all paper money is issued and redeemed by a private corporation upon a basis of specie on which the people are not taxed, while we redeem all our national-bank issues in gold taxed out of the people, and at the same time we pay the banks that issue the bills interest on the bonds upon faith of which they are issued. In England the basis of banking is specie, on which the people pay no interest, while in this country the basis of banking is the public credit, which rests alone on taxation to sustain it. We pay the national banks the interest in gold upon their capital. We allow them to convert that capital into money and use it at rates that seldom fall below 12 per cent per annum. We redeem their bills in gold raised by taxation, and exclude all landowners from borrowing money on pledges of their real estate.

The industrial classes are thus made servile, while those who create money under corporate charters escape taxation and become lords paramount in all but the name.

This bill makes this condition inevitable and perpetual.

In this debate I have pointed out already the manner in which these results are fastened upon the country, and I will only call attention now to the only creed known to the people of the United States that is opposed to this new revolution, which returns us to the dominion of the British system of finance.

That creed is the broad and historical ground upon which all Democrats have always stood. It is the payment of the national debt, not its perpetuity; that whatever banking is authorized by law shall be conducted on the specie basis; that the specie basis of all contracts, public and private, consists of gold and silver legal-tender coin. The national banks are based on the credit of the United States in the form of bonds. If that basis is removed by the payment of the bonds, they must provide for the redemption of their bills in specie or go out of business.

So that a resort to the old Democratic creed is the only plan by which the people can be saved from the destruction of their industries, the taxation that will never end, the loss of their real liberties, and their degradation as feudatories of the money power.

In doing this, by paying off the national debt, we shall also necessarily restore silver to its former equal rights with gold, and its full coinage will be then demanded by the national banks as the only means of securing a full specie basis for the redemption of their notes, and the Government will go out of the banking business.

We have but one way to enforce the will of the people in favor of silver money, so often expressed and so often baffled and disappointed by the friends of monopoly, of the national banks, and the other money corporations, associations, and combinations in Congress. It is to make it to the interest of the national banks to demand the full and free coinage of silver. This can only be done by the payment of the national debt.

That will take the foundation from beneath their banks and force them to the specie basis for the redemption of their bank notes, or they will have to go out of business. This they will never consent to, and they will at once become clamorous for the full and free coinage of silver to put into the foundations of their credit.

The object of this bill, so far as they are concerned, is to prevent this result, which is the necessary result of the payment of our national interest-bearing obligations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair regrets to inform the Senator that his time has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask the consent of the Senate to proceed for three or four minutes to finish my statement, as I do not expect to again take the floor.

Mr. STEWART. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alabama may be permitted to finish his remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Alabama will proceed.

Mr. MORGAN. I am much obliged to the Senate for its indulgence.

Mr. President, this bill makes the issue between the Democratic and Republican parties so deep and so broad that one or the other will fall under its decision, never to rise, if the people sustain this measure.

If they sustain this measure and vote the national debt shall be perpetual, they will thereby hand over to the national banks the whole control of their financial affairs, and will give them the power and the legal right, in cooperation with the other bondholding classes, to saddle a perpetual mortgage upon all who engage in the productive industries of the United States.

It is to save our country from this artful, quiet, cold, and almost silent revolution that I make this appeal to the old Democratic creed of Jefferson and Jackson, and implore the Democracy to take their stand upon the specie basis for the redemption of all contracts, public or private, whether made by corporations or by individuals.

If we will now adopt this true and ancient creed of the Democracy, that our national debt must be paid, and its converse proposition that the national debt shall not be made a perpetual burden on the people, and that the specie basis of gold and silver coin shall stand to redeem all money obligations, the Democrats of all the country and of all opinions as to what is sound money and what is the proper ratio between silver and gold, and as to the equal rights of gold and silver at the mints, and the necessity for gold as the money of foreign commerce, will forgo their doctrinal contentions and will gather under the old standard of Jefferson and Jackson without a man missing from the ranks.

This is our opportunity, and if we use it we can save the country from a social, moral, industrial, and political revolution that will preserve the Republic against that worst of despotisms—an incorporated monopoly of the money power, backed by the taxing power of the Government, for the benefit of the wealthy classes, at the cost of the toiling masses of the people.

Let the people denounce this measure at once, before it has had time to fasten upon them its fatal purposes and the destruction that otherwise is inevitable, and they will redeem themselves from a fate of which the class distinctions and poverty-ridden people of Europe will be only a mild example. Once we vote ourselves into slavery to the money power, the shackles will never fall from our limbs.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I rise simply to enter my protest against the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]. The general impression which was doubtless left upon the minds of the Senate by his remarks was that in the adoption of the bimetallic or the double standard in 1792 our authorities conferred with the leading commercial nations of the earth. I deny that our governmental authorities up to 1873 had at any time, in planning its financial system or in enacting its financial legislation, anything to do with foreign nations or foreign systems.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I do not know whether I ought to ask the Senator to yield to me for a moment, but I should like a short time.

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. What the Senator says is entirely true, that there was no agreement with foreign nations; but what happened was this: Hamilton in his report, in determining what should be the ratio between gold and silver, goes over each nation by itself and shows substantially that the ratio ranged from 15 to 1 to 16 to 1, but was a little over 15 to 1 at that time. He treats all through the consensus, the average, adopted by foreign nations as the ratio which we should establish. Then, in addition to that, he treats that as the ratio which we were to establish. Then he recognizes and adopts foreign coins and the legislation of his time as the coinage system to be used by the United States for an indefinite period. He then proceeds to fix by law not only the ratio of our own coins, but the value of Spanish dollars and other foreign coins. So he completely affirms the doctrine which I imputed to him as the whole basis and postulate of his argument. Then he goes on to say—if I may be permitted to read one sentence more, and that is all—as follows:

The Secretary is, upon the whole, strongly inclined to the opinion that a preference ought to be given to neither of the metals for the money unit.

A strong declaration of bimetallism. Then he goes on to say that—

Perhaps if either were to be preferred—

He uses in his cautious way the word "perhaps"—

Perhaps if either were to be preferred, it ought to be gold rather than silver.

The reasons are these:

The inducement to such a preference is to render the unit as little variable as possible—

The Senator will see how in this statement Alexander Hamilton sums up the whole argument and position of the majority of this Senate established by this bill and by the recent Republican national convention. If you had put what they said into the best words you could have got you would have taken the words of Alexander Hamilton which I have just read. Let me finish that sentence:

The inducement to such a preference is to render the unit as little variable as possible, because on this depends the steady value of all contracts and, in a certain sense, of all other property; and it is truly observed that if the unit belong indiscriminately to both the metals, it is subject to all the fluctuations that happen in the relative value which they bear to each other. But the same reason would lead to annexing it to that particular one—

Observe, he is only speaking where there is a necessity to take one metal—

which is itself the least liable to variation, if there be in this respect any discernible difference between the two.

Gold may, perhaps, in certain senses, be said to have greater stability than silver; as, being of superior value, less liberties have been taken with it in the regulations of different countries. Its standard has remained more uniform and it has in other respects undergone fewer changes, as, being not so much an article of merchandise, owing to the use made of silver in the trade with the East Indies and China, it is less liable to be influenced by circumstances of commercial demand; and if, reasoning by analogy, it could be affirmed that there is a physical probability of greater proportional increase in the quantity of silver than in that of gold, it would afford an additional reason for calculating on greater steadiness in the value of the latter.

In Mr. Jefferson's paper on the same subject, in his own way, he reaffirms that. It is put into the Constitution; and it is the doctrine of Daniel Webster. Mr. Webster himself always thought—in which his contemporaries and countrymen do not agree with him—that his greatest single service to mankind was his service upon questions of finance and that that was the subject he understood best—better even than constitutional law. Webster and Benton and Jackson and everybody in both parties of any sort of weight were agreed in those doctrines.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator had made his last speech first, there would have been no occasion for me making any reply. When you take his first remarks, they were that all the way along we had been guided by reference to the commercial nations of the world, and that we had agreed upon certain financial plans because they were in accord with those of the commercial nations of the world, and that finally we had drifted down to the present Republican bill as a legitimate result of all that had been done before. I controvert that statement. I say that there never has been a financial law enacted in the United States prior to 1873 where this Government, directly or indirectly, consulted any foreign nation; and in 1792, when we did not have a dollar of coin of the United States—not one—and had no mint, and had no power to coin, we adopted our monetary system after our own investigation into what were the legal—not commercial, but legal—ratios existing in foreign nations.

The only guide we had was to take those foreign coins, melt them, and ascertain the quantity of metal in them. After a thorough examination, without any consultation with France or with England or with Germany or any other nation, kingdom, or power on God's green earth, we established our American bimetallic constitutional system of the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the ratio prescribed by Congress, and we maintained that up to 1873. During that whole time, whenever the Democratic party or the old Whig party was in power, so far as that was concerned, there was a determination to have no entangling alliances with any foreign nation; and the immortal Jefferson, in his first inaugural address, proclaimed the true doctrine, which has been adhered to from that day to this by the party to which I have the honor of belonging—"Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none." That greatest of all great men of the world, George Washington, in his Farewell Address to the people, left them a legacy, an inheritance which should be honored and appreciated and loved so long as we love to be Americans. I will read from that Farewell Address as follows:

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other.

Pregnant truths, which should be taken to the hearts of the gold monometallists of to-day, who are bowing their knee to the golden calf worshiped by Great Britain and adopting a foreign system, transplanted from that power which would have held us in bondage and slavery to this day if she had had the physical power to do so.

The Farewell Address continues:

Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not legally hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

Now, we are called upon to adopt this gold standard because it is in comity with the standard of Great Britain, because it is in comity with the standard of Germany, and to ally ourselves to a foreign system and be dependent upon all the changes and fluctuations and adverse circumstances which may surround that standard in foreign countries, bringing home to our own doors all the ills and all the disadvantages which may result from that system in all the foreign nations of the world.

Why not adopt an American system—one of our own? Why cry before the world our insignificance, our incapacity, with 75,000,000 people, to do what we did in 1793 with 4,000,000 people? Then we established our system; we maintained it. To-day we can establish any system we desire; and I want nothing to do with any foreign financial system. I want our own financial system, separate and distinct from any other—an American system, which we are abundantly able to maintain, whatever it may be.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President—

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I was simply going to ask that we take a vote, but I yield to the Senator from Connecticut if he desires to speak.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, it seems to be the fashion in this discussion for each Senator, as he rises, to protest against something. I wish to protest against the assumption of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber who oppose this bill—the assumption that they represent the people of the United States. I do not know where they get the right to claim that they are the representatives of the people on this question.

This question went before the people of the United States in 1896, and went before them upon the platform of the Republican party, which announced—I do not suppose I am able to quote exactly the language, but the substance of it was that the United States would maintain the existing gold standard until bimetallism should be secured by the concurrence of the leading nations of the world, which the party pledged itself to promote.

That question went before the people, and notwithstanding the suppression of some half million votes, more or less, in this country, that policy and that declaration and that pledge received a majority of the votes of more than half a million of the people. Now, I stand here—

Mr. RAWLINS. Will the Senator from Connecticut permit me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAWLINS. If I understood the Senator's statement of the platform, it was that it pledged the Republican party to maintain the existing gold standard.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Exactly.

Mr. RAWLINS. With the limitation and qualification—

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If I did not use the word "existing," it was an oversight. I intended to use it.

Mr. RAWLINS. This is the question: Do you propose by this measure to change the system which existed at the time that platform was made?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not understand that this bill changes in any respect the gold standard as it exists before the passage of the bill.

Mr. HOAR. It does not change it; it maintains it, as the platform says.

Mr. RAWLINS. Then what is the object of the bill?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, those "representatives" of the people who continually insist that they alone represent the people have been trying to delude the people during all the years since the enunciation of that platform by saying that we were not on the gold standard, and they have been shouting with the same breath that the United States was not on the gold standard, and denouncing everybody who did not agree with them as parties to the crime of 1873. What was the crime of 1873 if it did not place the United States on the gold standard? The existing gold standard was what we promised to maintain until we could get international bimetallism, and this bill is for the purpose of making it sure that we do maintain the existing gold standard and taking away from the representatives of free silver the opportunity to say that the Government is not on the gold standard to-day. If it had not been for the continual misrepresentations of those who advocate free silver coinage, there would be no occasion for the passage of this bill.

But, Mr. President, I protest that they do not represent the people. With all the suppression of the vote in the last Presidential election there was a majority of more than a half million of the people of the United States for the maintenance of the existing gold standard until we could secure international bimetallism by the concurrence of the leading commercial nations of the world; and if they wish to go to the people again on the doctrine of the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1, which I believe means silver monometallism, they will find to their cost and sorrow that that majority will be largely increased in the next Presidential election.

I am obliged to the Senator from Missouri for removing all disguise from the issue in the next Presidential campaign. I am obliged to him for proclaiming the leading doctrine of the Democratic party and its representatives in the last Presidential canvass and its representative in the next Presidential canvass. Whatever may be said about anti-imperialism and about trusts and about the money power and about corporations and about the toiling masses and the classes, it will be the same issue over again, and that is whether the United States shall attempt to change the existing gold standard in this country into a silver standard.

Mr. President, we heard when the Senator from Nevada made his speech here something about the alchemist and alchemy. There never was any such alchemy as is now proposed by the Senator from Missouri. Of all men who have sought the philosopher's stone which should transmute base metals into gold, the Senator from Missouri is entitled to a patent for the discovery. Only it does not happen to be a stone. It is a law which is to transmute silver into gold. Of all the conjurers and magicians and wizards who have existed in times past and in times present and who sought to delude the people, no one has reached the sublime height of saying that by the passage of the law and the signing of the President's name to it you could increase the value of a commodity the world over 100 per cent. Neither Cagliostro nor Hermann nor Kellar nor Frank Daniels would ever aspire to any such distinction. It remained for the wizard of Missouri to wave his magic wand or magic pen and thus raise the price of all the silver in the world 100 per cent. How much? One-half certainly, and more than one-half of the silver coin of the world, although made a full tender, passes for only 50 per cent as much as the gold of the same denomination.

Mr. COCKRELL. What did I understand the Senator to say? Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. TELLER. Make that statement again.

Mr. COCKRELL. Do I understand that the \$119,000,000 in Germany, containing 3 cents less silver than ours, only pass for 50 cents?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I have not said any such thing.

Mr. COCKRELL. You came very near it, I think.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I did state that one-half of the silver money of the world to-day, in round numbers, passed in the countries of coinage and in all countries for not more than 50 cents on the dollar of gold of the same denomination.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator permit me to ask him one question?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Yes.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask him to name any great commercial nation—

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Oh, I am not talking about great commercial nations. I am talking on an entirely different subject now. I am talking about what the Senator from Missouri proposes to do with his magic pen, when it shall have written a law; and I say that of the four thousand millions, more or less, of silver money in the world at least two thousand millions of it passes at 50 per cent or thereabouts as compared with the value of gold money of the same denomination. He proposes to make that entire stock of money, depreciated money, as in Mexico,

India, and China, and wherever it is to be found all over the world, as good as gold. A thousand million dollars of value created by one touch of the pen! And not only that, but all the silver of the world, in bullion, in ornaments, or in whatever shape it may exist, is thereupon immediately to become worth a dollar and twenty-nine cents an ounce instead of less than half of that.

Mr. President, if it were anywhere else than in the Senate of the United States, I should simply say that this proposition is too ridiculous for anybody to believe. I see that my time has expired.

Mr. ALDRICH. Question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. I understand that the Senator from Alabama offered an amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from what State?

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. I understood that he offered an amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No amendment was sent to the desk.

Mr. ALDRICH. He read it in his place, and I understood he offered it. If it is not pending, it is all right.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I may have misunderstood the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT]. Before I go ahead I should like to know what he did say. I have the misfortune to sit behind him, and I could not hear. I understood him to say that the silver money of the world was circulating now at 50 cents on the dollar, nominally, with the gold in the country where it is circulating. What was it the Senator said?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I said, speaking in round numbers, that one-half of the coined silver money of the world is passing at only 50 per cent or thereabouts of gold money of the same denomination.

Mr. ALDRICH. In the same countries?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. In the same countries.

Mr. TELLER. I want to say to the Senator that he is misinformed. There is no foundation for that statement. The silver money of the world, where gold is circulating with it concurrently, is circulating at the same ratio.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Would not a gold dollar, if there were one in Mexico, buy two silver dollars; and would not a gold dollar, if there were one in India, buy two silver dollars?

Mr. TELLER. In the first place, there is not any gold in circulation in Mexico.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Because silver, having depreciated to 50 cents on the dollar of gold, has driven it all out.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator there again shows his unacquaintance with the facts. There never was a gold circulation in Mexico at any time. Never at any time while the mints have been open has there been a gold circulation. The Treasury Department give them in a report which they make here more gold than silver, but that is evidently an error, because everybody knows that is not true. Take the coin of Great Britain—a hundred and eleven millions of it circulating at a limited tender. It does the same money duty, when you have 20 shillings of it, that a sovereign does. It buys as much of anything that the Englishman wants as a sovereign buys. Ten marks of silver in Germany buys as much as a ten-mark gold piece buys.

Mr. President, this is not the place for misrepresentations of that character. This is the place where facts and not falsehoods ought to be presented to the American people. There is not a country anywhere that maintains the standard of gold and silver where the silver does not do the same money duty, at the rate established by law, that it did previous to 1873.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Did I deny that silver circulated on a parity with gold in Germany or the United States or England?

Mr. TELLER. If he has denied anything at all, that is what he did deny by that statement. It was intended to go out to the American people that where they have the two moneys in circulation, one half is doing money duty at 50 cents on the dollar and the other is doing it at a dollar—a hundred cents.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator from Colorado a question?

Mr. TELLER. I will yield to a question. I will not hear any speech from the Senator.

Mr. HOAR. You will not hear any speech from me?

Mr. TELLER. No; I can not afford it.

Mr. HOAR. Is there any country in the world having an unlimited coinage of silver where the silver dollar is worth more than 50 per cent of the gold dollar?

Mr. TELLER. I will answer you now. You can not answer it for me. I will take Mexico. I speak with knowledge, for I made a trip to Mexico for the express purpose of considering its financial condition. I stayed there six weeks, with as good an opportunity as any man who did not hold a commission from the Government could have. I interviewed merchants, I interviewed bankers, I interviewed everybody from the head of the Govern-

ment down. I say to you to-day that when I was there, in 1893—there has been a little rise in things in Mexico since, not because of the money, but because of the prosperity there—a Mexican dollar would buy as much of all the products of Mexico as it would buy twenty years ago or thirty years ago. It did not buy quite as much of foreign imports, but I can go to Mexico to-day with silver money and buy many articles that are sold in the United States upon a gold basis with less silver money than you can buy with gold.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator does not answer my question. Let me put it in another form.

Mr. TELLER. You can put it in any form you choose.

Mr. HOAR. If you put an English gold sovereign in your pocket and go to a banker or a money changer in the City of Mexico, will he not give you for it nearly or quite double its nominal value in Mexican silver dollars?

Mr. TELLER. Nobody denies that.

Mr. HOAR. Very well; that is what I want to get at.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. TELLER. No; Mexico has no gold coin.

Mr. HOAR. I understand.

Mr. TELLER. When the gold of the world gets there it is merchandise. When you take your gold there in the shape of a sovereign they know that they can send it back—

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator let me ask him one question?

Mr. TELLER. No. I want to get through with one at a time. You will have plenty of time.

Mexico is a country of limited circulation. How do we maintain here at a parity five hundred millions in silver, and more than that? It is because we are a great commercial nation and there is a demand for it. Mexico has never had a gold standard, I repeat. She has never had any gold in circulation. You can buy it at the brokers, you can buy it at the banks, but you buy it as merchandise. It is not in use and there is no analogy between that condition and this.

What the Senator from Connecticut was proclaiming was with respect to the circulation of the world. France maintains eight hundred or a thousand million dollars of silver, although I know that it is twice what the Treasury Department gives her, on an absolute parity with her gold, and the circulation in the common shops of France is not gold, but silver. The one hundred and eleven millions of silver money in the Kingdom of Great Britain does more money duty in the purchase of articles—except in great transactions—than the five hundred millions of gold. What I have said of England is absolutely true of Germany, Holland, Belgium, and of every other country where they pretend to have a gold circulation.

Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut says that in 1896 this question was settled. In New England I know this party had a face of gold, but out in the West it had a face one side of which was gold and one side silver. It was a bimetallic party in all the country west of the Alleghenies. I said the other day that I made speeches in ten States. I challenge any man to show me that the Republican orators in those States stood up and said, "We are a gold-standard party." You pointed always to the bimetallic provision. You said existing conditions must be preserved. You did not say to the public, "We are going to change these conditions materially;" and the people did not vote on that subject. You got a great vote in Kansas, in Nebraska, in Minnesota, in Iowa, and in other sections from people who were not gold-standard people. They may eventually be brought into the gold-standard fold by the pressure of party prejudice and party sympathy and party pride, but they have not been there yet. The highest authority from the President's State, in one of the great places where men have influence, declared that that bimetallic provision put a hundred men in the last House of Representatives who would not have been there if it had not been in the platform. I do not know whether that is true or not, but I know you did not make a campaign upon the gold standard.

The American people have not declared for the gold standard. You may make them. It will take more money than you spent in 1896, if you do make them, to carry it, and in 1896 the party of which you boast, the party to which you belong, spent more than it ever spent from the hour it came into existence up to that time. You spent two dollars where the aggregate expenses had been one from the very foundation of the party in 1856 to the hour you nominated McKinley. You may do it again. You may close the factories or threaten to and frighten the people into voting for the gold standard. You may do what you did in all the great cities of the East. You may say to the employees, "If you vote for Mr. Bryan and he is elected, this factory closes." You did it in Chicago; you did it in all the great cities, I repeat, and in all the great manufacturing centers. You may do it again. You may get an expression of the people, but you did not get it then. The people were walked up, under the threat of starvation and discharge

from their employment, and they voted for the ticket under coercion; and they did not believe then that you were a gold-standard party, and you did not dare to say you were in two-thirds of the area of the United States.

The Senator from Connecticut is nothing if he is not a prophet. I remember once here when he prophesied—and he particularly prophesied as to myself—that a position I had taken would not be sustained by the people of my State. Mr. President, they sustained me by more than 85 per cent of the vote, and so it is not worth while for the Senator to tell us what is going to happen next time. We do not know what is going to happen. We are willing to make this campaign and take the chances. If the American people say they are for the gold standard, that is the end of it. The Senator complains that we say we are the representatives of the people. I do not think anybody will accuse the Senator from Connecticut of being a representative of the people especially. I do not know that he has misrepresented the people of his State. I do not know what their sentiments are. I presume they are for the gold standard. I have no doubt the people of Connecticut are, and probably he properly represents them in that way, but Connecticut is not all of the United States by any means. There is some section of it besides which has something to say about these questions and will continue to have, notwithstanding the Senator may enter his very earnest protest.

I mean to assert, in spite of the Senator, that I stand for the American people, if I know what their sentiments are. When I shall find that their sentiments differ with mine, I shall find that I am of no further use in this Chamber—I mean on this great question. I will be ready to quit when that occurs. I do not believe that the American people are a gold-standard people. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts told the truth when he said a couple of years ago, or three years ago, that 90 per cent of the people were bimetallists. I believe they are now. I believe they want bimetallism. You are afraid they want it, and therefore you put in this childish and foolish statement in the bill that this bill is not intended as an obstacle or hindrance to bimetallism.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, we are all the while getting something new in the Senate of the United States. We are getting new definitions, and we have now what seems to me to be a new definition of bimetallism. Bimetallism as proclaimed to-day is the opening of our mints to the free coinage of silver at a certain ratio. The opening of our mints to the free coinage of silver in olden times, in the times of the Constitution, when our friends are wont to boast that gold and silver were made the money of the Constitution, meant to the coinage of gold and silver at a ratio that then represented as nearly as it was possible an equivalence in value between the two metals. Now there is no bimetallism except for the opening of the mints of the United States alone at a ratio which represents a divergence of one-half in the equivalence of the two metals.

I will say this: If I believed that we could open our mints to the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, and thereby bring to a parity throughout the world the value of the two metals and maintain it there, my objection to free coinage as preached by the new financiers of the United States would be largely diminished, if not entirely eliminated. But there comes the exact difference between us. We do not believe it. We do not see how it is possible for anybody, taking into consideration the history of the past, taking into consideration all the laws which govern currency and finances, to believe that silver money can be maintained in the United States at a parity with gold upon the ratio of 16 to 1.

The fathers did not believe it. Nobody believed it up to a recent period. The greatest care was taken in opening our mints to see that the quantity of silver which was coined into a dollar should equal, as nearly as possible, in all markets the value of gold that was coined into a dollar. We had that law; we had a ratio, and up to 1873, if I am not mistaken, the mints had been open to the free coinage of both, and in that year there came for the first time a divergence between the two metals as to the value of the gold or silver represented in a dollar. In 1873 there was a divergence of about 8 or 9 per cent.

Mr. ALLISON. Not 1873; in 1878.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. In 1878.

Mr. STEWART. Oh, no; in 1873 silver was at a premium.

Mr. TELLER. Silver was at a premium in 1873.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I was incorrect. I intended to say that the divergence came in 1878, or shortly before that. From that day the gulf between gold and silver value has been widening. It has not been the result of law. If law has had any influence upon it, it is not entirely responsible for the widening of the gulf. Silver went steadily down from 1878 as compared with the gold in commercial value until 1890. In the meantime, between 1878 and 1890, we were coining more silver than we had ever coined annually at any previous time in our history, and yet the divergence grew.

Then in 1890 we were told that if we would only purchase 4,500,000

ounces of silver per month and coin it into silver coin it would raise the price of silver to its old price and the ratio price of \$1.29 an ounce. We did it, Mr. President. We believed that. We were told over and over again that all we had to do to raise the price of silver from what it was then to \$1.29 an ounce the world over was to buy and coin 4,500,000 ounces per month, and we carried that on for three years. I do not remember now how much it was annually that we coined.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Fifty-four million ounces.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. We coined 54,000,000 ounces annually, but the number of dollars was much greater, and still the price of silver went steadily down; the divergence grew wider and wider. Then we repealed the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act, and still the price of silver has gone down as compared with the price of gold, but not so rapidly as it did from the years 1890 to 1893, when we were purchasing the four and a half million ounces per month, which we were told was going to elevate silver to the price of gold.

And now we have come to this, that there is no bimetallism except free coinage at 16 to 1; that no one believes in bimetallism who does not believe that we can take silver, now worth 47 cents on the dollar as compared with gold commercially, and raise it to the parity of gold by just opening our mints at that ratio.

If a man believes in another ratio he is not a bimetallist. If he believes in the ratio which represents the real parity of value between gold and silver that man is not a bimetallist at all. He must believe what is beyond belief, what it is incomprehensible to suppose that any man believes, that we can take these two metals with all this divergence, one being worth half as much in the market as the other, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and make them equal in the market the world over.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator from Connecticut allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I protest against the assertion, so far as I am concerned, that I insist that every bimetallist must believe that we are capable of coining silver at 16 to 1 ourselves and sustain it. I myself know men whom I regard as good bimetallists as anybody in the world who do not believe that, and I have never accused them of inconsistency or anything else. One of the best bimetallist men that I ever knew, and one of the most intelligent, was General Walker, who never believed that we could do it alone. He was a bimetallist, he was an intelligent man, a man for whom I had great respect and great affection.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Well, Mr. President, we have parties and parties in this country, and we have representatives and representatives of parties. I am rather pleased to see that the Senator from Colorado, who represents one party, does not quite agree with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], who represents another party. This is what the Senator from Missouri said:

Mr. President, this country, with the people inhabiting it, can make any laws on the financial question it desires, and it can maintain them. It is a disgrace to our people and our race to say we can not maintain a financial system at the ratio of 16 to 1 or 15 to 1.

That is the bimetallism of the Senator from Missouri, at any rate.

Mr. SPOONER. He went further and stated that he did not want international bimetallism.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. He said that he does not want any international bimetallism; that he does not want any change in the ratio. He wants that old thing which has been inscribed on the banners of the Democratic party of this country for the last ten years to delude the people of the country—16 to 1 or nothing.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I was delighted with the beautiful imagery that the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] cast over me when he spoke about my attempting to wave the wand and by the pen give value to a commodity. Prior to 1873 throughout the world the commercial value of gold and silver was their coining value at the ratio of 15½ to 1. Why was the commercial value then equal to the coining value? Because law gave to that silver bullion free and unlimited coinage into full legal-tender money at that ratio, and that law fixed that commercial value and nothing else.

Mr. ALDRICH. What law?

Mr. COCKRELL. The law giving to silver free and unlimited coinage into full legal tender.

Mr. ALDRICH. Whose law?

Mr. COCKRELL. In France, in the United States, in Germany, that was upon the silver standard alone after 1857 to 1871, and in other countries.

Mr. ALDRICH. You mean international bimetallism, in other words?

Mr. COCKRELL. Not international bimetallism at all; each nation independent of every other, and no nation belittling and degrading and dishonoring itself and its people by asking a foreign nation to come and help it establish its monetary system.

Mr. ALDRICH. But all substantially on the same basis.

Mr. COCKRELL. Now, Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut says that I am trying by the magic of the pen, the wave of the wand, to make the commercial value of silver bullion equal to its coining value and equal to gold. The Senator says that the depreciation began in 1878. In that the Senator is mistaken. There was no divergence between silver and gold prior to 1873. On the contrary, the standard silver dollar of 412½ grains weight, nine parts fine, as a commodity was worth 3 cents more than gold.

Mr. ALDRICH. How could that be, in the face of the law the Senator spoke of?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I corrected myself. It was a slip of the tongue, Mr. President. I corrected myself. I was talking about 1873 when I meant 1878.

Mr. COCKRELL. Now, when did the depreciation of silver commence? It commenced in 1873. What caused it? Now, I appeal to the Senator to lay aside his inveterate prejudices against silver and look at the facts of history. What caused the divergence in the commercial value of silver relatively to gold and in its divergence from its coining value? It was law. Law. The mysterious wand of law was drawn and the legal-tender power and free coinage were taken away from silver. What was the effect of it? It began to depreciate. It was law that caused the depreciation of silver. No intelligent man can deny it. If it had not been for law, there would have been no depreciation of silver, and every sane man knows it. It was the law of Germany, passing from a single silver standard to a single gold standard; it was the law of the United States demonetizing silver; it was the law of the Latin Union closing the mints to the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

Every man who has ever pretended to have any knowledge of the facts of history admits that it was legislation which caused the divergence between silver and gold; and the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] who sits before me time and again has said that if that legislation had been directed against gold and in favor of silver, that gold would have depreciated as silver has done. The Senator from Rhode Island can not deny that proposition, that if the legislation enacted against silver in 1873 and subsequently, and in favor of gold, had been in favor of silver and against gold, gold would have depreciated commercially, as silver has done.

Mr. ALDRICH. I understand—

Mr. COCKRELL. Now, I put the question. I have only ten minutes. Say yes or no. Was it legislation that caused the depreciation or not? I dare you to say yes or no. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALDRICH. I will answer your question in my own way.

Mr. COCKRELL. Answer the question. It needs no explanation. I assert that it was legislation which caused the depreciation of silver relatively to gold.

Mr. ALDRICH. What legislation?

Mr. COCKRELL. And I will say that if—

Mr. ALDRICH. Whose legislation?

Mr. COCKRELL. If that legislation had been directed against gold and in favor of silver, gold would have depreciated just as silver did, and I challenge the Senator to deny it.

Mr. ALDRICH. Whose legislation was it that depreciated gold? Mr. COCKRELL. It does not make a bit of difference whose legislation it was. Do not dodge it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not dodging it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Come square up and toe the mark. Say yes or no. I dare you to do it. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALDRICH. I say that the same legislation which demonetized silver can rehabilitate it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then you say that if the same legislation had been directed against gold and in favor of silver it would have caused the depreciation of gold?

Mr. ALDRICH. Unquestionably.

Mr. COCKRELL. Unquestionably. Then why did you not answer it at the beginning? [Laughter.] Mr. President, it is only then a question of power. They admit that legislation can bring it up, and the arguments of my distinguished friend from Connecticut have been swept away. It is legislation that caused the depreciation, and legislation can restore and cause the appreciation. It is only a question of how much legislation is necessary.

Mr. ALDRICH. Not how much, but whose legislation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. COCKRELL. I have heard him answer a question once flatfooted, and I will yield to him almost any time now.

Mr. ALDRICH. I always answer questions.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is so refreshing. Now, Mr. President, legislation caused the depreciation of silver. Had it been directed against gold and in favor of silver, gold would have depreciated and silver would have appreciated. Now, what we propose is by legislation to restore silver to its former status.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no,

Mr. COCKRELL. Now wait.

Mr. ALDRICH. But you take one single country.

Mr. COCKRELL. Wait. It is only a question of power. The Senator admits that by cooperation with other nations we can do it. Then it takes a certain quantum of power; and now the question is, Has the United States that power?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly not.

Mr. COCKRELL. Now wait. What power is necessary? We will get down now to the logic of it. How much power is necessary to maintain the commercial value of silver bullion equal to its coining value? A power sufficient to accept and utilize as money all the silver that can be offered at the mints of that nation. That is all; no more, no less—that is all. Whenever you can show a nation or two nations or three nations or four nations that by opening their mints to the free and unlimited coinage of silver at a fixed ratio relatively with gold, can take and coin and utilize as money all the silver that is offered, then you have the commercial value of silver bullion equal to its coining value.

Mr. ALDRICH rose.

Mr. COCKRELL. Wait a moment, now. I have got him cornered. [Laughter.] It is a question of power; a question of power pure and simple; a question of capacity to take and utilize all the silver that is offered. Now, that is the only question.

Now, the Senator says we can not do it alone—that that will drive us to silver monometallism—but that we can do it by combination with other nations. I say that we can do it alone. I say that this great nation, the greatest in the world, with resources far beyond the capacity that the whole of Europe had when Europe maintained the equality of gold and silver at the ratio of 15½ to 1, when we have infinitely greater power of consumption and assumption and assimilation—

Mr. ALDRICH. Assumption, yes.

Mr. COCKRELL. And of products to exchange for silver the world over, we can by our open mints take and utilize every ounce of silver that will ever come to our mints, and we will still cry for more. It is only a question of power, a question of capacity to coin and utilize all the silver that will be offered; nothing more and nothing less and nothing else.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to get him to make a speech just by himself so we could get at him.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am trying to—

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator interrogates me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island must be recognized by the Chair before he can proceed.

Mr. COCKRELL. I will yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri yields to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri whether he thinks that if France and the other States of the Latin Union had continued to coin silver, had kept their mints open to the free coinage of silver at a ratio of 15½ to 1, and if the other nations of the world that were then using silver had maintained its use, the act of 1873 by itself would have depreciated silver?

Mr. COCKRELL. The act of 1873?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes. Would the act of 1873 have depreciated silver, the mints of France and the States of the Latin Union and all the other countries of the world having gone to a coinage of both gold and silver at the ratio—

Mr. COCKRELL. Would it have depreciated silver?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes. Would the act of 1873 have depreciated it?

Mr. COCKRELL. Not of itself, it would not.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is the whole of it; that is the whole question.

Mr. COCKRELL. Because the other nations—

Mr. ALDRICH. Then, how can we by an act restore it?

Mr. COCKRELL. The other nations had the power to consume all that was offered.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator's answer was sufficient for me.

Mr. COCKRELL. How easily satisfied the Senator is! He will just take almost anything.

Mr. ALDRICH. If an act of this country could not have depreciated silver, how can an act of this country appreciate it?

Mr. COCKRELL. We were not on a coin basis then; we were not using gold and silver; and that had all on earth to do with it. We never could resume specie payments until 1879.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Missouri and all of the people who agree with him have always contended that the fact that we were not upon a coin basis had nothing to do with what they call the crime of 1873.

Mr. COCKRELL. The crime of 1873—

Mr. ALDRICH. There was no crime about it.

Mr. COCKRELL. It was a crime against God and humanity and civilization and Christianity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.
Mr. STEWART. Mr. President—

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator from Nevada yield to me for a moment to put some figures in the RECORD which I intended to do when I was up before?

Mr. STEWART. Very well; but I do not want it to come out of my time, because I have some remarks to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the Chair will recognize the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. There was a great increase in the production of silver in the years from 1866 to 1895 and continuing until the present time. I think that that increase had something to do with the depreciation of silver, and I want to put in the figures.

From 1866 to 1870, a five-year period, the production of the world in fine ounces was 215,257,914;

For the next five-year period, 1871 to 1875, it was 316,585,069;

For the next five-year period, 1876 to 1880, it was 393,878,009;

For the next five-year period, 1881 to 1885, it was 460,019,722;

For the next five-year period, 1886 to 1890, it was 544,557,155; and

For the next five-year period, 1891 to 1895, it was 787,906,656 of fine ounces of silver, as compared with the period of five years from 1866 to 1870 of only 215,257,914 ounces; and the production has been going on substantially in that ratio ever since.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the assertion is often made that this bill is for the purpose of maintaining the existing gold standard. Inasmuch as that is the pledge in the platform of the Republican party, which no doubt will be observed by the Republicans everywhere with great fidelity, I propose to suggest a modification of the bill that will prevent a palpable, plain, unmistakable, bold violation of that pledge.

I give notice that at the proper time I will offer an amendment striking out from the substitute bill of the Senate committee the word "gold" wherever it appears in that bill. In every case where it appears it appears as a qualification of coin. In all the legislation previous to this time that word was omitted. The term "coin" was used in the act of July 14, 1870, when the public debt which now exists was provided for, and as to all of it issued under that act, it provides for the payment of that debt in gold and silver coin of the then standard value.

The resumption act of 1875 provided for the resumption in coin, not in gold coin. In purchasing bonds to get coin for redemption the act provided for the purchase of the same kind of bonds defined in the act of July 14, 1870. It has been admitted all the time, in every debate for the last twenty years, that all our obligations were payable in coin.

It is true the Secretary of the Treasury has been giving them gold when they wanted gold, because his friends were on that side, but not because it was the law. No man ever claimed that the obligations of the United States were payable in gold coin as against silver coin. All the Secretaries admitted that that was the law, but they had a higher policy than the law. There was never anybody who denied that that was the law.

Now, this bill strikes from the statute books coin of gold or silver and substitutes gold coin alone. That is not the gold standard which has existed. The gold standard which existed at the time of the meeting of the St. Louis convention and that now exists is the gold standard of usurpation of the Treasury Department, not the gold standard of the law. I do not wish to have the usurpations of the Treasury Department incorporated into law, particularly under a false assertion that that has been the law all the time.

Now, if you strike out the word "gold" and leave the standard as it was, you will have some consistency; but you propose to change the coin which you said you would maintain, the standard which you said you would maintain, which was in the law.

I deny that we have ever had the gold standard in this country, for every dollar of silver coined had the same purchasing power as every dollar of gold. Nor have they had the gold standard in France. Silver is there doing duty as money, and it is not depreciated one hair's breadth. It is as good as it ever was. They have about \$100,000,000 or thereabouts in Germany, which is a full legal tender, as good as gold, because it has not been debased or degraded.

Now, here it is proposed in this bill to degrade the silver coin that we have and say that it shall not be received in the payment of public dues; that the public debts shall be paid in gold; that the reserve shall be gold. It is changing the standard. It is going back on the pledge. It is a plain violation of the pledge when you claim that it is the same standard. It ought not to be put forth to the country. It ought not to deceive anybody. It is false that the same standard is provided in this bill that has been in existence in this country from the beginning. It is false to make such a statement. I hope those who maintain the truth of that statement will prove that I am wrong and show me any statute where an existing obligation is made payable in gold. It is

true that gold certificates and silver certificates have been deposited to take it out; but where is there a debt to be paid, where is there full legal tender, where is there coin to be paid, that silver coin will not pay where gold coin will, by statute?

Before you say that you are maintaining the existing gold standard, tell me why it is that you deny to silver the function that it has enjoyed by statute all the time since the foundation of this Government. Tell me why you do that, and then I can understand you; but I can not understand a law which says we are maintaining the present gold standard. If you are acting in good faith with regard to this matter, you will strike out the word "gold" and leave it "coin," as it has stood from the beginning. Let it stand as it has stood. Do not change it. Be consistent with yourselves. Let the Treasury Department make the standard by usurpation, but do not legalize that usurpation nor enact into law a declaration which is false. I hope that those who think they are maintaining the same standard by this bill will hurry to strike out the word "gold" and leave the statutes for the payment of all obligations as they now are, in either gold or silver coin, at the option of the debtor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TELLER. I offer a substitute for the committee's amendment:

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the substitute offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The SECRETARY. Strike out the amendment proposed by the committee, and insert:

The people of the United States are in favor of bimetalism and desirous of an international agreement with the great commercial nations of the world that will admit of the use of both gold and silver at such an established ratio as will maintain the parity between gold and silver coin, and the efforts of the Government are hereby pledged to endeavor to secure such international agreement as speedily as possible.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. TELLER. I do not see the chairman of the committee in his seat; but after his effusive declaration for bimetalism I presume the chairman will accept the amendment I have offered. If he does, it will simplify matters very materially.

Mr. ALDRICH. I see no reason why the chairman of the committee should accept that amendment. All these amendments are simply offered to embarrass the committee and to embarrass this side of the Chamber who intend to support the bill. There is no amendment which could be put on it that would secure the vote of the Senator from Colorado. That is very well understood. They are all antagonistic amendments to this bill.

Mr. TELLER. I agree to that last statement. I do not believe that you could amend it in this Senate so that I could vote for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I have not offered that amendment as an embarrassment to the bill, though I should not vote for it if it was put on, I will admit. But if the proposed amendment of the committee means anything at all, if it is to have any influence itself, I certainly think my amendment is an improvement on it, because this is a virile and live provision. The other is negative; this is affirmative.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no doubt my friend from Colorado thinks he could improve every section and every line of the bill.

Mr. STEWART. He could.

Mr. ALDRICH. I presume he could, as the Senator from Nevada says, but the committee prefer their own language.

Mr. TELLER. I wish the Senator would tell me what objection there is to the phraseology I propose.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have tried to state it as frankly as I could. I should not care to reenact the Ten Commandments on this bill, however much I might be in favor of them.

Mr. TELLER. I do not wish to enter upon any discussion of the amendment. I will call for the yeas and nays upon agreeing to it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like to have the amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado as a substitute for the amendment of the committee will be read.

Mr. VEST. Read both.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the committee will be first read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add the following as a new section:

SEC. 9. That the provisions of this act are not intended to place any obstacles in the way of the accomplishment of international bimetalism, provided the same be secured by concurrent action of the leading commercial nations of the world and at a ratio which shall insure permanence of relative value between gold and silver.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed as a

substitute by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] will now be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

The people of the United States are in favor of bimetalism and desirous of an international agreement with the great commercial nations of the world that will admit of the use of both gold and silver at such an established ratio as will maintain the parity between gold and silver coins; and the efforts of the Government are hereby pledged to endeavor to secure such an international agreement as speedily as possible.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, if I could frame the language of this side of the Chamber respecting an amendment which reiterates and reaffirms the principles and policy of the Republican party as to the restoration of bimetalism, I should make it strong and vigorous and unqualified and earnest. I should probably add many phrases to the declaration as it appears in the amendment reported by the committee. But, Mr. President, I can not make the language for the Committee on Finance; I can not frame the language for this side of the Chamber. In good faith I accept the declarations of honorable Senators belonging to a party whose record is one of honor and not of dishonor; and when, to a man, they state on the floor of this Senate that they are believers in the principles of international bimetalism, that they stand ready to assist in bringing about the accomplishment of that beneficent result, as an honest man I accept that statement and am grateful for that admission and that appendage to this bill respecting the currency.

I accept it, Mr. President, because I know it is made in good faith. It may be, in the opinion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], puny and futile; it may be, in the opinion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], humiliating and disgraceful; but it is enough for me and it is enough for any man who wants to be a Republican and is a bimetalist and wants to believe that the Republican party will not agree to the reopening of the American mints at 16 to 1 without considering the wishes of any other country, but do stand ready to assist in bringing about, with the consent of the leading nations of the world, the restoration of the bimetallic system at some fair ratio. And because I believe that I accept it, and I am not going to be driven from my earnest desire as a Republican to stand with the committee and stand with the party by changes of phraseology, however specious or however attractive they may be.

It may be true—I hope it is, Mr. President—that the people of the United States are in favor of bimetalism and desirous of an international agreement; but I do not conceive it to be my duty as a Senator of the United States to enact upon the statute books of our country a statement as to the beliefs of the people of the United States.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I hardly know how to interpret the situation on the Democratic side of the Chamber and the attitude of the Democratic party toward international bimetalism. I am a firm believer in international bimetalism; but I find that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] is violently opposed to it. In order that I may do him no injustice, I wish to read from the RECORD what he said yesterday in the debate on the financial bill. He used this language:

I do not want any international agreement.

How does that sound to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], a great light and leader also in the Democratic party, who has just introduced and is pressing earnestly an amendment favoring international bimetalism? The Senator from Missouri says further:

I would not bind the United States in any agreement of a financial character in any shape, manner, or form.

It seems to me the Senator from Missouri is bound to vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado. Again, the Senator from Missouri said, in speaking of an international agreement:

I do not want any alliance with any other nation. I do not want any assistance from any other nation.

Mr. President, I take it that the Senator from Missouri speaks by authority for his party, as he is its acknowledged leader on the floor of the Senate and stands next to Mr. Bryan in prominence in his party.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator from West Virginia allow a question there?

Mr. ELKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Does not the Senator from West Virginia know that immediately after the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] so expressed himself he was the only Senator who voted with the Republicans in favor of the then pending proposition?

Mr. ELKINS. Who did?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The Senator from Missouri who made that statement is the only Senator on this side of the Chamber who voted with the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Arkansas is mistaken.

Mr. ELKINS. I do not understand the politics of the other side of the Chamber. [Laughter.] No one else can from the differences and confusion that exists to-day on that side on the question of finance.

Mr. VEST. I did not use the language which the Senator from West Virginia has read, but I did vote with the Republicans yesterday, and gave my reasons for the vote I cast.

Mr. ELKINS. And I congratulate the Senator upon his vote, but not upon his reasons. [Laughter.]

Mr. VEST. It was my colleague [Mr. COCKRELL] who made the statement which has been read.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I beg pardon. I find I was misinformed. I thought it was the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST].

Mr. ELKINS. No, Mr. President; I distinctly stated that I read from the speech of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], and in doing so I took occasion to say I wished to use his own language, as he stood the acknowledged leader of his party on this floor. I do not want to misrepresent the other side in the approaching campaign, and I was very glad to have the explicit statement of the Senator from Missouri, who speaks for the Democratic party in this Chamber, that he was opposed to international bimetalism. No one denies this.

Mr. TILLMAN. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. ELKINS. Yes, with pleasure.

Mr. TILLMAN. Are you in favor of any alliance with any European nation?

Mr. ELKINS. I am in favor of an arrangement with European nations to increase the use of silver as money throughout the world, because I do not think we can do it by ourselves.

Mr. TILLMAN. Would you limit your agreement or your alliance or your arrangement to money only; and if so, why?

Mr. ELKINS. We have the money question up now. That is one thing, and let us deal with one thing at a time. I would first get an arrangement about money and then decide about other things when and as they come up; I cross one bridge at a time and not until I get to it; but I am not opposed to any alliance with other countries that will be helpful to the development of our trade and commerce and in the interest of our people.

Mr. President, this world is fast becoming a vast neighborhood. The nations of the world are more closely connected than were counties in States sixty or seventy years ago. Every morning we know what goes on in every part of the world; we know the changes in the markets and the movements in business and commerce, and the idea that we can set up for ourselves, that we can be a part of the great world of finance and business, leading the world in both and declare at the same time that we will use only our kind of money, no matter what it is, and not agree with other nations on a uniform standard, is a great mistake.

Every Senator must admit that the best thing that could happen in the financial world in the interest of trade and commerce would be an agreement among the nations of the world as to the standard of value and the use of the same kind of money, so that we could have one common standard of value for the entire commercial world. Everybody must admit that this would be a wise arrangement, because nations are so closely linked together in financial and trade transactions. We can not stand alone, we can not have bimetalism alone, any more than we could expect one State or one county to have one measure of value with a different measure in another State or in another county.

Mr. President, it seems to me if we are to take the Senator from Missouri as the proper authority, as the leader on this floor of the Democracy in the approaching campaign, that his party are the real enemies of silver, as I have always claimed. Notwithstanding all the charges of the Republican party being an enemy to silver, there is no greater enemy to silver, it seems to me, than the Senator from Missouri and those who stand with him. They want no assistance; they want no aid; they want no international arrangement as to the use of silver, although such an arrangement might lead to the use of all the silver that could be produced as money. I had supposed that all parties were agreed that an international arrangement would be the best thing for this country and for the world; but to-day the Democratic party declares its opposition to any arrangement that will permit the use of all the silver in the world as money while Republicans heartily favor such an arrangement.

I wish to say that, in my judgment, if there is a little patience about the money question it will settle itself. You can not legislate values; you can not legislate what value Europe will put upon our money any more than you can by legislation fix the prices in Europe of products on this side of the Atlantic Ocean, and compel Europe to accept our valuation. Therefore we should agree on a common standard of value.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. ELKINS. Very well.

Mr. STEWART. I ask if the question will settle itself, why pass this bill?

Mr. ELKINS. It will settle itself, and sooner than the Senator thinks.

Mr. STEWART. I do not think so, and so I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. ELKINS. The Senator knows that the world is producing gold so rapidly and we are getting so much gold for our exports, that in a few years we shall have enough gold to make all the money we may need; and if so, this will settle not only the silver, but the currency question. That is what Senators on the other side are afraid of in the approaching campaign. The Democratic party do not want the money question settled, even if it will give the people and country all the gold needed to carry on business, and the use of all the silver that can be safely used.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, our currency amounts now to about two thousand millions of dollars. We all know that every dollar of it is good, and the volume of good money is increasing rapidly. We are all satisfied, and the world is satisfied; we are doing very well; we are carrying on trade and commerce in volume that simply startles the imagination. Who is making this complaint about money?

The only fear the Democratic party has, I will say to the Senator from Colorado, is that in the next ten years we shall have enough gold to do the business of the world. Silver will continue to be used as money as much as may be needed for all purposes in the business world, but the money of the future will become form of paper or certificate of deposit, which will be represented by gold or which will be redeemable in gold. We will also have silver certificates maintained equal in value to gold so far as they can be used with safety.

It seems to me the rapid increase of gold will settle the currency question without any legislation of the kind proposed and advocated by Senators on the other side of the Chamber. The time is at hand, owing to the rapid increase in the production of gold, when we can confidently believe that anyone having gold dollars or gold bullion can deposit the same and get certificates for the same redeemable in gold, making the best money in the world.

This will be far better than establishing a national bank, buying bonds, and taking out note circulation. Under this arrangement there will be no need of a public debt or bonds as a basis to insure a safe and sound currency. Going directly to the Treasury with gold will be the shortest and best way to get certificates of deposit. These certificates will take the place of national-bank notes without injury.

Of the two thousand millions of currency we have only two hundred and seven millions of national-bank notes, or about one-tenth. If the banks do not find note circulation profitable, as they do not, then instead of putting out a bond that can not be redeemed in thirty years as a basis for national-bank notes, why not let gold certificates take their place? This would allow us to go on paying off our national debt instead of perpetuating it in order to furnish a basis for national-bank note circulation when it may not be needed, because gold certificates or paper redeemable in gold issued directly against gold deposited in the Treasury will be far better.

I am very glad to hear from so great an authority as the Senator from Missouri the emphatic declaration that the Democratic party do not want any international arrangement; do not want any aid or assistance; and I want to make this statement so strong that it will not be denied in the next campaign.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, it is unjust to my colleague [Mr. COCKRELL] and myself for the mistake to be made that I made his declaration upon yesterday and that he voted with the Republicans, as stated by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES]. I voted with the Republicans, and gave my reasons for doing so.

When the proposition was made here some years ago to send a commission abroad in order to bring about an international conference as to bimetalism, I did not vote for it. I was absent from the Senate upon a sick bed at the time, and I did not pair upon that question. If I had been here, I should have voted against it then, because I believed then, as I believe now, that such a project is utterly impracticable.

I supposed when the Democratic party announced in their platforms, national, State, and county, that they were for the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1, without regard to what might be done by foreign nations, that we meant it, and that we were prepared to do what must be done in order to save bimetalism and take our position behind silver and defend it, as France did for nearly seventy years.

Why, Mr. President, it would seem from what is said now upon this floor that there is a unanimity with foreign nations in regard to this question of gold and silver. I had occasion in 1893 to read from the reports of the Herschel commission, showing that there were all sorts of differences in the systems of the nations of the world as to the question of gold, silver, and paper. I will ask the Secretary now to read the conclusion arrived at by the Herschel

commission in regard to the monetary systems throughout all the nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

(a) With little or no gold coin, as in Scandinavia, Holland, and Canada; (b) Without a mint or gold coinage, as in Canada and the Dutch East Indies;

(c) With a circulation consisting partly of gold, partly of overvalued and inconvertible silver, which is legal tender to an unlimited amount, as in France and other countries of the Latin Union, in the United States, and also in Germany, though there the proportion of overvalued silver is more limited, the mints in all these countries being freely open to gold, but not to silver, and in some of them the silver coinage having ceased;

(d) With a system under which the banks part with gold freely for export, as in Holland, or refuse it for export, as in France;

(e) With mints closed against private coinage of both silver and gold, and with a currency of inconvertible paper, as has been temporarily the case in Austria;

(f) With a circulation based on gold, but consisting of token silver, which, however, is legal tender to an unlimited extent, as in the West Indies. The case of Holland and Java is very remarkable, since in that case the gold standard has been maintained without difficulty in both countries, although there is no mint in the Dutch East Indies, no stock of gold there, and a moderate stock of gold in Holland; whilst the currency consists of silver and paper legally and practically inconvertible into gold, except for purposes of export. The case of Canada, which maintains a gold standard without a gold coinage, is also very remarkable.

The case of Austria-Hungary is also interesting, and presents a remarkable contrast to that of India.

It will be seen that a country with a silver standard, and a currency consisting partly of overvalued silver, but chiefly of inconvertible paper, has been able, by closing its mints against private coinage for a series of years, and whilst still continuing to coin silver on Government account, to maintain a fairly steady rate of exchange with gold-using countries for a considerable period preparatory to adopting a gold standard.

Mr. VEST. Those were the conclusions of the Herschel commission, appointed by the British Parliament to investigate the question of closing the mints of India. It will be seen that there is no systematic and uniform arrangement of this money question throughout the world. The exports of every country determine the value of its legal-tender money. That is an axiomatic rule from which there can be no variation.

We have heard a great deal here about the silver of Mexico being depreciated. Mexico exports a few hides, some coffee, and a considerable amount of silver. In 1899—and I have the official report before me—Mexico exported in round numbers 70,000,000 pesos or Mexican dollars' worth of domestic merchandise. The valuation of a peso in 1899 in American money was 46 cents on the dollar, and in American money the amount of exports of that country was about \$34,000,000.

As the result of this, when the Mexican dollar is outside of the territorial limits of Mexico it sinks to the value of silver bullion commercially. But how is it with the silver dollar of the United States? It is as good in Europe as the gold dollar. I had occasion in the debate of 1893 to state that when I happened to be at Carlsbad, in Austria, a banker there had offered to give me gold or Austrian money for any amount of the silver of the United States, either silver certificates or silver dollars, because, as he expressed it, the silver dollars of the United States, being full legal tender, could equally with gold purchase any of our salable products. After all, then, it is a question of exports as to the value of the legal-tender money of any country.

The Mexican dollar has nearly 6½ grains more of standard silver in it than the dollar of the United States; and yet our dollar is worth all over the world 100 cents, because we exported at the end of the fiscal year 1899 one billion two hundred and sixty-odd million dollars of domestic merchandise, excluding gold and silver. That is the reason why our legal-tender money, no matter whether it be greenbacks or silver, is equal to gold anywhere.

Mr. President, if the time ever comes, as predicted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] who has just spoken, that by reason of gold discoveries this country will be flooded with gold, we shall have exactly the same condition of things that we had in 1850 and 1851, after the discovery of gold in California. I remember distinctly when the bankers of the United States in 1850 called for the demonetization of gold. They were under the impression that this country would be flooded and inundated with gold; and they then declared for silver and against gold distinctly and emphatically. The only motive they have or ever will have is to have the money of the United States in that coin which will purchase more than any other, and which will increase the income of the wealthy classes.

The whole struggle now, as it has been from the time when money was first invented, is between the money changers and capitalists, who want to make money dearer and higher, with a larger purchasing capacity, and the people without money, who are dependent upon their labor in order to obtain even the necessities of life. To-day we see the United States in the same struggle which has occurred in all the nations of the world. In the Old World, where there are privileged classes, where there are men living from year to year upon fixed incomes, as in England and in some nations of the Continent, the struggle is to establish the gold standard, because they believe that gold is scarcer than silver.

We, being the largest producing and exporting country in the world, can sustain silver as France sustained it. If we abandon it, it is as certain as anything can be in the future that the last struggle for bimetalism has been made, and that the capitalists and money changers have triumphed.

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. President, I believe it due to my colleagues and to myself that I should make a few observations on the pending bill.

Mr. President, the position that I have heretofore taken on kindred measures, is well known to every Senator in this Chamber. When I addressed the Senate in 1893 on the bill to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act, I conscientiously believed that the United States alone could establish and maintain the parity between gold and silver by opening its mints to the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. With the changed conditions which soon thereafter followed, I became apprehensive that this was too great an undertaking for a single nation. I have, however, steadily adhered to bimetalism.

Mr. President, admitting that we have heretofore been unsuccessful in making an agreement with other countries, I am in favor of again negotiating with foreign nations with a view of agreeing upon a parity between gold and silver, and in my judgment the day is not far distant when the principal nations of the Old World will invite the United States to join them in a conference for the purpose of establishing an international ratio of bimetalism. The bill reported by the Committee on Finance, and upon which we will to-day record our votes, provides for such a conference for the purpose of establishing a ratio.

The platform of the national Republican party adopted in convention at St. Louis in 1896 contained a similar provision. The delegates in that convention not in harmony with that provision vacated their seats and retired from the convention. Believing then, as I do now, that the St. Louis platform provided all that this nation could hope to accomplish for silver and bimetalism in the absence of an international agreement, I remained with the convention. Supplementary to this view, I wish to add that in my judgment there are other principles advocated and incorporated in Republican platforms which are of great moment and importance.

In order that my position at the time of the last Presidential campaign may be better understood, I beg to quote from an address I issued to the Republicans of Idaho shortly after the St. Louis convention:

Realizing that the integrity of the Republican party in this State is endangered by a conflict of views upon the subject of bimetalism, a principle long cherished and advocated by a majority of the Republican party, but respecting the best method of accomplishing which there has always been a diversity of opinion, it is deemed wise and patriotic at this time to set forth a few facts, which may serve to direct the conduct of unwavering Republicans and inspire in the hearts of the faltering a renewed loyalty to the grandest political organization known to the history of this Government.

No political party has ever yet succeeded in formulating a creed which in all particulars met the unqualified approval of every member of the organization; and no party is likely to arise within the lifetime of this generation that can hope to attain to that degree of perfection. Therefore each individual citizen, sensible of the imperfection of all human contrivances, should associate himself with that political party which in its aims, professions, and achievements reflects most nearly his own views of correct and successful government.

The question which confronts the Republicans of Idaho to-day is this: Ought we to sever our connection with the national organization because it is not in strict accord with many of us as to the best method of establishing bimetalism? This is the sole subject of difference between the national party and the Republicans of Idaho. Is this difference sufficient cause for alienation? I believe not; and, moreover, I am firmly convinced that within the Republican party rests the best promise for the cause of bimetalism. On the other hand, what assurance have we that abandonment of the Republican party will contribute anything toward the desired result? * * *

It is my profound conviction that when the intelligent Republicans of Idaho have carefully and calmly considered the situation in this State they will conclude that they can not afford to make the sacrifice required; can not afford to incur the risks which abandonment of the Republican party at such a time as this involves, but will continue in their unflinching allegiance to the party which has given the country all the sound and beneficent legislation it has enjoyed during the past thirty years. In this connection I am impelled to the declaration that an independent financial system must be coupled with the enactment of a law protecting all our industrial and commercial interests, which can only be accomplished through the Republican party. * * *

Forty years ago the Republican party first raised its standard. Under its folds were arranged all that was purest in American citizenship and best in American statesmanship. To its triumphs on many fields not only our country but the civilized world owes a debt of gratitude for its achievements in the cause of progress and humanity. That standard has not yet been lowered, and will not be until the beneficent mission of the Republican party, identical with the Republic itself, has been accomplished.

By the declaration in favor of international bimetalism as provided for in the pending bill the position of the United States is reiterated to the world and in a manner to admit of no question as to our sincerity.

Mr. President, the people of the State of Idaho in 1896 saw fit to cast the electoral vote of the State for the Democratic candidate. They were told that the election of Mr. McKinley would result in prolonging hard times, low prices, and want of confidence.

On the contrary, the dominance of the Republican party has brought to our State, in common with the rest of the United States,

a period of unexampled prosperity and satisfaction with existing conditions.

The Dingley tariff law has been a source of great benefit to our people. Under it the most important industries of our State have been encouraged and developed. Business is better than it has ever been before, land values are higher, mortgages have been greatly diminished, and our people are happy and contented.

The Northwest, which so short a time ago was faltering in its support of the Republican party, is to-day in harmony with the President of the United States in his policy, both foreign and domestic.

Believing this measure does not in any way endanger the cause of bimetalism, but rather aids its ultimate accomplishment, and that when the recognition of silver comes it will be through the efforts of the Republican party, I shall vote for the committee amendment and the bill.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], and I shall vote against it mindful of the pledge which was made by the Republican party in St. Louis to promote the cause of bimetalism. I think the amendment offered by the Senator is not legislation.

Mr. TELLER. May I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he thinks the amendment offered by the committee is legislation?

Mr. SPOONER. I think the amendment offered by the committee is entirely proper to be placed in a bill which is legislation. I think the distinction between the amendment offered by the committee and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado is a very plain one. The amendment offered by the committee is an amendment declaring the intention of the body which passes the bill as to its construction. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado is an attempt to declare by Congress what the wish of the American people is upon a particular subject.

Mr. President, the pledge which was made by the Republican party in St. Louis was speedily redeemed and crystallized into law; and if any doubt has been cast or could be cast upon the attitude of the party or the attitude of the Government as to the subject covered by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado, it is such an amendment as he has offered.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate and to place upon record the act of 1897, passed only three years ago, the first section of which reads as follows:

That whenever—

"Whenever," at any time—

after March 4, 1897, the President of the United States shall determine that the United States should be represented at any international conference called by the United States or any other country—

Authorizing him to call it, contemplating the fact that other countries might call it; a continuing statute, in every sense as vital to-day as it was the day the President affixed his signature to it, and speaking in unmistakable terms the attitude of the United States upon this subject—

with a view to securing by international agreement a fixity of relative value between gold and silver as money by means of a common ratio between these metals, with free mintage at such ratio, he is hereby authorized to appoint five or more commissioners to such international conference; and for compensation of said commissioners and for all reasonable expenses connected therewith, to be approved by the Secretary of State, including the proportion to be paid by the United States of the joint expenses of any such conference, the sum of \$100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated.

It did not refer to any particular conference. It did not refer to any conference called by any particular government, but it authorized the President, whenever any conference is called upon this subject either by the United States or by any other government, to send commissioners, and it appropriates the sum of \$100,000 for the payment of the expenses, and \$75,000 of that appropriation, under this continuing act, lies in the Treasury of the United States and can be used for that purpose.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Eighty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. SPOONER. Eighty-five thousand dollars. Section 2 was a special provision:

That the President of the United States is hereby authorized, in the name of the Government of the United States, to call, in his discretion, such international conference, to assemble at such point as may be agreed upon. And he is further authorized, if in his judgment the purpose specified in the first section hereof can thus be better attained, to appoint one or more special commissioners or envoys to such of the nations of Europe as he may designate to seek by diplomatic negotiations an international agreement for the purpose specified in the first section hereof. And in case of such appointment so much of the appropriation herein made as shall be necessary shall be available for the proper expenses and compensation of such commissioners or envoys.

The President saw fit to exercise not the general and continuing power conferred by the first section, but to appoint special commissioners and envoys under the second section, and he appointed a commission. It may be that the special power given by the second section is spent. He appointed a commission, admirable in every way, headed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], known all over this country to be a firm and sturdy friend of international bimetalism, able in every way, if there is

any man in this country to accomplish it, to present by argument the cause of bimetalism, and I think no one in the country will dispute that every proper resource which could be employed by men was employed by him and his associates to bring about that result. No greater glory in this world could have come to him than to have brought back from Europe an international agreement.

The President never acted under the first section. He appointed the special envoys under the second section. Very likely he could still act under the second section. The only possible argument, and that would be purely technical, which could be made as to his power to act under the second section is that he has once exercised the power.

Mr. TELLER. He could act again.

Mr. SPOONER. I rather agree with the Senator from Colorado, that he could still act under the second section, but I take it that no lawyer can deny, and no one has here denied, that he can act under the first section, and that there is a law then upon the statute book authorizing him to call a conference and authorizing him at any time when any government calls a conference to appoint commissioners to attend it.

Mr. President, there would be no necessity whatever for the amendment offered by the committee, I am frank to say that there would be no particular appropriateness in it, although it is a legitimate method of legislation, but for the fact that it has been said over and over again, I think here and I know elsewhere, that this bill is intended, if enacted into law, to put an end, so far as the United States is concerned, to any effort for international bimetalism—in other words, to change the statutory status of the United States upon that subject. Therefore we reported from the committee, what is often done, a declaration that it is not the intention of the Congress which passes the bill to lay by its provisions any obstacle in the way of international bimetalism.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, we have charged more than that. We have charged that the bill itself would do it without any reference to its intention. The committees deal with the intention only, I notice. I am free to say that I think the act which the Senator from Wisconsin has read is in force and the President can appoint a commission under it if he sees fit, so far as that is concerned.

The Senator says that this is not good legislation which I have suggested. I wish to call the attention of the Senator to the act of 1893, and it is about all I do want to say on the subject.

And it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the equal power of the dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetalism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts.

The majority of the Republican members of this body voted for that law. I did not vote for it; not because I was opposed to the declaration that was made, but because in voting for it I would have had to vote for the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, which I did not choose to do.

Mr. President, I know Senators are anxious to get a vote; I have no desire to discuss the matter, and I will refrain from saying anything further on this amendment. I am willing to have a vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the substitute for the committee's amendment, offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER].

Mr. TELLER. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TALIAFERRO (when Mr. MALLORY's name was called). My colleague is ill and necessarily absent. He is paired on this question.

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. PETTUS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY]. If he were here, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER], who is detained from the Senate on account of illness. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WETMORE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], who is absent. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MONEY. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SULLIVAN] is paired on this question with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BATE. I wish to state that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] is ill and can not be here. He is paired as announced by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE].

Mr. TELLER. I wish to state that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] is sick and is paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLINGTON]. If the Senator from South Dakota were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. McCUMBER. I am paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN]. I transfer my pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. ALDRICH. I beg to say that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLINGTON] is absent on account of illness and if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. BUTLER. In accordance with the announcement just made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], while I have a general pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLINGTON], he is paired on this bill with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW]. That leaves me free to vote on all questions connected with the pending bill without any further announcement. Before I vote, however, I wish to state that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] is absent from the Chamber, and on all votes on this bill he is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. I vote "yea."

Mr. KENNEY. I desire to state that the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER] is detained from the Chamber by sickness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. Were he here, he would vote "yea."

Mr. MASON (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. SULLIVAN]. He is absent, and I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. PROCTOR. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY] to the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. PETTUS. Under that arrangement I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 45; as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bate,	Culberson,	McEnery,	Stewart,
Berry,	Daniel,	McLaurin,	Taliaferro,
Butler,	Harris,	Martin,	Teller,
Chandler,	Heitfeld,	Money,	Tillman,
Chilton,	Jones, Ark.	Morgan,	Turley,
Clark, Mont.	Jones, Nev.	Pettus,	Vest.
Clay,	Kenney,	Rawlins,	

NAYS—45.

Aldrich,	Fairbanks,	McBride,	Ross,
Allison,	Foraker,	McComas,	Scott,
Beveridge,	Foster,	McCumber,	Sewell,
Burrows,	Frye,	McMillan,	Shoup,
Caffery,	Gear,	Nelson,	Simon,
Carter,	Hale,	Penrose,	Spooner,
Clark, Wyo.	Hanna,	Perkins,	Thurston,
Cullom,	Hansbrough,	Platt, Conn.	Wetmore,
Davis,	Hawley,	Platt, N. Y.	Wolcott.
Deboe,	Kean,	Pritchard,	
Depew,	Lindsay,	Proctor,	
Elkins,	Lodge,	Quarles,	

NOT VOTING—14.

Allen,	Gallinger,	Mason,	Warren,
Bacon,	Hoar,	Pettigrew,	Wellington.
Baker,	Kyle,	Sullivan,	
Cockrell,	Mallory,	Turner,	

So Mr. TELLER's substitute for the amendment of the Committee on Finance was rejected.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I have no desire to delay a vote, as I know everybody wants to have a vote and dispose of the bill. There are some propositions I should like to make, but as on the votes which have been taken the entire Republican membership of this body with one exception have voted against the amendments, I think I will submit to the chairman of the committee, who seems to have the power of excluding all our amendments, the question whether he will accept certain amendments if I offer them. If not, I do not propose to ask the Senate to take a vote on them.

I should like to know whether he should allow this to go in. I want to tell the Senate, before I offer it, what it is, because it is very evident that the Senate has forgotten. It is an extract from the platform of the Republican party of 1892. I am sure it will not be recognized by at least some of our friends on this side of the Chamber if I do not make that statement:

The American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetalism, and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as standard money, with such restrictions and under such provisions, to be determined by legislation, as will secure the maintenance of the parity of values of the two metals so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal.

I should like to know whether the Senator will accept that or whether, if I call for a vote, he will insist upon voting it down?

Mr. ALDRICH. Read what is proposed in all, and I shall be very glad to answer, or do you want an answer to this?

Mr. TELLER. I want an answer to this. There is one other to which I will call the attention of the Senator.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will say to the Senator from Colorado very frankly that I shall resist, and I shall ask the friends of the bill to resist any declaratory recital of the nature he has suggested, without any regard to my personal opinion or the opinions of Senators upon this side of the Chamber as to the declarations themselves. It is no part of the purpose of Senators in supporting this bill to incorporate into it the various Republican platforms which have been adopted since the party first had existence.

Mr. TELLER. This is a proper amendment which I propose to offer to the pending amendment. I do not desire to take the time of the Senate unnecessarily. The Senator has been frank in saying he is opposed to it. Will the Senator be embarrassed if I ask him—

Mr. ALDRICH. I am in favor of the platform. It was the platform of the Republican party, and I voted for the candidate of that party upon it, but I think it would be manifestly improper to incorporate that platform into this bill.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator has got a sort of platform in this measure, and I think this would be a great improvement on it. I want to ask the Senator—if it will embarrass him he need not answer it—whether he thinks the Republican majority in this Chamber, with the exception of one Senator who voted for my proposition, will all vote against this?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; under these circumstances.

Mr. TELLER. Then I will not offer it, because it is as good as offered. But there is another one to which I wish to call the attention of Senators. I have a declaration of political faith that came to the people in the spring of 1896 with a great deal of satisfaction, I think, the declaration made in the State of Ohio, the State which was about to present, as everybody knew, a candidate who was reasonably sure to be successful at least in securing the nomination, whatever doubt there might have been about his election. I will read it and ask the Senator whether he objects to it as an amendment to the pending amendment:

We contend for honest money, for a currency of gold, silver, and paper, with which to measure our exchanges, that shall be as sound as the Government and as untarnished as its honor, and to that end we favor bimetallicism and demand the use of both gold and silver as standard money, either in accordance with a ratio to be fixed by an international agreement, if that can be obtained, or under such restrictions and such provisions to be determined by legislation as will secure the maintenance of the parities of value of the two metals, so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal.

Mr. ALDRICH. We have crystallized that platform into a bill and propose to legislate on that subject. I have been perfectly frank in answering the Senator from Colorado the question he asked me, and now I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. TELLER. You can do so.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will he and the Senators who vote with him on this subject agree, now or hereafter, to support this Republican platform that he is reading? Is that their purpose? Is it their purpose, too, to express confidence in and to approve of the platform that he is reading it in this presence?

Mr. SPOONER. Would he vote for the bill if it were put on?

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator vote for the bill if this platform is put on?

Mr. TELLER. No, I will not. The Senator need—

Mr. ALDRICH. Will any of the Senators who are acting with him vote for it?

Mr. TELLER. I hope not.

Mr. President, I supported, to the best of my ability, the candidate under the first proposition that I read. I could support a candidate on that proposition if it was made in good faith. I shall never have an opportunity again to support a Republican candidate on a bimetallic platform that means anything. They may put in the next platform some foolish and useless provision for the purpose of deceiving the public, as they did in 1896, which did not deceive me; but if they would make either one of these the basis of an honest declaration there are thousands of men who did not support Mr. McKinley who might then support the Republican candidate, but there is no probability of their doing it. The Senator says that this has not any place there. It has as much place in the bill as the declaration that he has got there.

Mr. President, I knew if we got a vote we could not vote this in. I knew that when the party dictated by its caucus action every man, no matter what his personal and private opinions might be on this subject, had to stand up to the dictates of the Indiana junta, and that there was not any practical use of moving any further amendments. Therefore, Mr. President, I shall move no further amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course all legislation is ultimately put in shape by the conference committee. I do not rise to move an amendment, but to make a suggestion to the Committee on Finance, of which the Senator from Rhode Island is chairman, and

he will be the chairman of the committee of conference. It is that when this amendment is considered in conference he oblige some of us by putting six more words into it, so that it will read:

That the provisions of this act are not intended to place any obstacles in the way of the accomplishment of international bimetallicism, which we pledge ourselves to promote, provided the same be secured by concurrent action of the leading commercial nations of the world and at a ratio which shall insure permanence of relative value between gold and silver.

To hold out a little inducement to the Senator, I will say that if he will get that in in the conference, I will vote to concur in the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. TELLER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLAY (when Mr. BACON's name was called). I will state that on this bill and all the amendments my colleague [Mr. BACON] is paired with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE]. My colleague is unable to be in the Senate during the votes to-day.

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). As I stated before, I am paired with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER]. I neglected to state when I was on my feet before what would be his vote and what would be mine. I understood from him before leaving the Chamber yesterday that his vote would be against all amendments offered by the committee and against the Senate bill, and would be for such amendments as were offered upon his side. That would be exactly the opposite of my position; and I declare now, so that I may not repeat it, that I should vote, were I at liberty, "yea" upon this amendment, and that I would vote for such amendments as are offered by the Committee on Finance and vote in the affirmative upon the bill itself. Having made that explanation, I will not refer to it again, but simply announce the pair.

Mr. WETMORE (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER], who is also absent, and vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. TELLER. I wish again to announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] is sick, and would vote "nay" if present. He is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLINGTON].

The result was announced—yeas 45; nays 30.

YEAS—45.

Aldrich,	Fairbanks,	McBride,	Ross,
Allison,	Foraker,	McComas,	Scott,
Beveridge,	Foster,	McCumber,	Sewell,
Burrows,	Frye,	McMillan,	Shoup,
Carter,	Gear,	Mason,	Simon,
Chandler,	Hale,	Nelson,	Spooner,
Clark, Wyo.	Hanna,	Penrose,	Thurston,
Cullom,	Hansbrough,	Perkins,	Wetmore,
Davis,	Hawley,	Platt, Conn.	Wolcott,
Deboe,	Hoar,	Platt, N. Y.	
Depew,	Kean,	Pritchard,	
Elkins,	Lodge,	Quarles,	

NAYS—30.

Bate,	Culberson,	McEnery,	Sullivan,
Berry,	Daniel,	McLaurin,	Taliaferro,
Butler,	Harris,	Martin,	Teller,
Caffery,	Heitfeld,	Money,	Tillman,
Chilton,	Jones, Ark.	Morgan,	Turley,
Clark, Mont.	Jones, Nev.	Pettus,	Vest,
Clay,	Kenney,	Rawlins,	
Cockrell,	Lindsay,	Stewart,	

NOT VOTING—11.

Allen,	Gallinger,	Pettigrew,	Warren,
Bacon,	Kyle,	Proctor,	Wellington.
Baker,	Mallory,	Turner,	

So the amendment of the Committee on Finance to the substitute reported by the committee was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN. I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment just adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To what does the Senator offer an amendment?

Mr. MORGAN. I offer it as a substitute for the amendment of the committee as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That can not be done now. That amendment has just been adopted.

Mr. MORGAN. The amendment of the committee as amended. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a substitute for the entire committee amendment?

Mr. MORGAN. As a substitute for the amendment of the committee as amended.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that it is not in order at the present moment until the amendment is perfected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is in order if no other amendments are to be offered.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the Senator from Arkansas has an amendment to offer.

Mr. MORGAN. I offered this amendment on the 31st day of January.

Mr. BERRY. I should like to ask if it is not in order to offer this as a substitute for the committee's amendment?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; not at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be in order in time; but if Senators desire to propose any amendments to the amendment reported from the committee, they would take precedence of the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama, because the amendment offered by the committee is entitled to be perfected, but any amendment proposing to strike it out entirely is in order.

Mr. MORGAN. That is very clear.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to inquire if the bill has been reported to the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has not.

Mr. HOAR. Very well; then the Senator's amendment will be in order when the bill gets in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Undoubtedly.

Mr. HOAR. Because then the question will be on concurring in the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following—

Mr. CULLOM. That is not in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas is open to the same objection now.

Mr. STEWART. I have an amendment to offer to the substitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada offers an amendment which will be read.

The SECRETARY. Amend by striking out the word "gold" wherever it occurs in the committee's substitute.

Mr. STEWART. That will leave—

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada a question. In several instances in the bill gold certificates are mentioned. How would the Senator designate them in his amendment?

Mr. STEWART. I will say "except as to gold certificates."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then I suggest that he change his amendment so that it shall not exclude all mention of gold certificates.

Mr. STEWART. No; I propose to strike out "gold" except where gold certificates are referred to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like to have it so that we could understand just where we are, Mr. President.

Mr. STEWART. I propose simply to continue the law as it now stands, and to say "coin" where "gold coin" is used in the bill. "Coin" was formerly used and my amendment substitutes coin again for gold.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I call attention to the first two lines of the substitute to show how it would read if this amendment should be adopted:

That the dollar consisting of 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine shall, as established by section, etc., continue to be the standard unit of value.

Strike out "gold" it would read this way:

That the dollar consisting of 25.8 grains of nine-tenths fine shall, etc.

[Laughter.]

Mr. STEWART. That declaration is false any how. That would suit me exactly. I want to bring up the question of restoring silver. Any little phraseology can be arranged if you put back silver where it was. If you are going to maintain the gold standard as it was, you will strike out "gold" wherever it occurs in this bill, except where reference is made to certificates or something of that character.

In the first place, gold resumption is in this bill. It is not in the gold-standard law as it now exists. In the second place, gold bonds are in the bill. It is not in the law. In the law all the bonds now outstanding are payable in gold and silver coin, at the ratio that existed July 14, 1870; and so on, wherever it relates to obligations. If there is anything as to the phraseology of certificates, that can be ascertained afterwards.

The question is whether the Republican party are willing to maintain the gold standard as it existed in the spring of 1896, which they pledged themselves to do until they could get an international agreement. The question is whether they intend to do that, or whether they are dissatisfied with it and are going to change it and destroy the full legal-tender power of the silver dollar as a reserve, as resumption money, as bond-paying money, as interest-paying money. The question is whether they are going to take that power away from the silver dollar, and if it is the intention to change the gold standard. They call it the gold standard. I call it the double standard, so far as the use of money is concerned, up to this time. It is now the double standard,

The only gold standard we have ever had in this country was the usurpation standard of the Treasury Department, which has been denounced again and again for twenty years here and never defended except on the ground of expediency, that the bondholders ought to have gold, and the Treasury had to pay it to them. Nobody ever contended that it was the law. That never was contended. Now it is proposed to change the law, and I want it understood that it is changed by deliberate vote, so that people may not be deceived by the declaration that they are maintaining the gold standard as it existed in 1896, when they are changing it and substituting a legal gold standard for an usurped gold standard. If you are going to make that change, I want it done by a deliberate vote, and I want the yeas and nays on this amendment. Perhaps the phraseology can be changed as to the gold certificate, if that be the opinion of the committee, and I will modify it so it will not apply to the first clause in the first section.

Mr. ALLISON. I suggest to the Senator that if he wants a test vote on the general question—

Mr. STEWART. The general question is whether obligations can be made payable in gold alone which are now payable in silver, and I want a vote on that question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Nevada please modify his amendment as he desires to have it presented to the Senate?

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that a viva voce vote be taken on this question.

Mr. STEWART. I want the yeas and nays on it.

Mr. ALDRICH. Very well; we might as well dispose of it at one time as at another.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada desires to modify his proposed amendment.

Mr. TELLER. I suggest to the Senator that if he will except from that general sweeping provision in the first section of the committee's amendment—

Mr. STEWART. The last part of the first section relates to the redemption in gold. I can not do that.

Mr. TELLER. Well, the provision as to the unit.

Mr. ALDRICH. I presume the Senator's purpose would be accomplished as well by moving to substitute silver in place of gold wherever it appears in the bill.

Mr. STEWART. Not at all. Coin means both gold and silver. I will modify the amendment so as to strike out "gold" wherever it occurs, except in the first clause of the first section, where it relates to the unit, and in any other sections where it relates to gold certificates. In all other cases I ask that the word "gold" be stricken out.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. That is intelligible.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not understand what effect this will have on the bill, and I for one will have to insist on having the bill read as it would be if the amendment were adopted before I am ready to vote on a proposition of this kind. I am perfectly willing to vote for what the Senator declares as his purpose to declare that the bonds of the Government of the United States shall not be payable in gold. If he will make the amendment so as to apply to them, I shall vote for it with pleasure; but I want to see what sort of effect a sweeping proposition of this sort will have on the entire bill.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest that the simplest way, and the only way which is in order—as the Senator can not, if anybody object, make a motion to strike out a certain word wherever it occurs in the bill—is to move it as a separate and independent amendment in each case. If he does that, it will take a very short time, and the Senator from Arkansas will then see without reading the bill what the proposed change means.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I quite agree with what the Senator from Massachusetts says.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Nevada wishes a test vote on the question of gold.

Mr. STEWART. In order to bring it out I will make my motion specific. I move to strike out the word "gold" in line 22 on page 10 of the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. That will not do. That is not what the Senator wants.

Mr. STEWART. That is one of the places where I should like to have the word "gold" stricken out.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I suggest, in view of the utterances of the Senator from Arkansas, that some Democrats should be added to the subcommittee of which Senator STEWART is chairman. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEWART. I will offer my own amendment now. I want it to apply to the redemption of greenbacks and Treasury notes. Wherever the law is changed I want to have my amendment apply. On page 10, line 22, I move to strike out "gold." In line 2, page 11, after the word "in," I move to strike out "gold;" on the same page, line 8, after the word "any," strike out "gold;" on the same page, line 15, after the word "the," I move to strike out "gold," leaving it "coin" in each instance; on page 12, line

3, after the word "in," I move to strike out "gold" and leave it "coin;" on page 12, line 6, after the word "the," I move to strike out "gold," leaving "coin" to stand, and on the same page, line 13, after the word "the," I move to strike out "gold."

Mr. ALDRICH. That is enough. That will make a test vote.
Mr. STEWART. That covers all the cases I care about. That will make a test vote.

Mr. ALLISON. That, I think, is enough.
Mr. STEWART. I will state in explanation that that leaves the law where it is so far as the redemption of greenbacks and Treasury notes and the payment of the public debt and the reserve in the Treasury are concerned. It leaves the law just where it now stands—"coin."

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Chair to state what the question is.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed amendment will be read to the Senate.

The SECRETARY. In line 23, page 10, it is proposed, before the word "coin," to strike out the word "gold."

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. How will it read then?

The SECRETARY. The closing paragraph would read:

And United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, when presented to the Treasury for redemption shall be redeemed in coin of such standard.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I call the attention of the Senator from Nevada to the fact that that proposed amendment is absolutely inconsistent with everything else in the section. It has no bearing on the section; it does not change a solitary thing in it. It is to pay the same standard coin that is provided for above in the section, which is the gold standard of 25.8 grains to the dollar.

Mr. STEWART. Well, we can modify that further and say "in coin of the standard value of July 14, 1870." That is what they are payable in now.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to suggest to the Senator that if he wants to get a vote as to whether we shall make the obligations of the Government not now payable in gold hereafter payable in gold, he can get it by inserting his amendment on page 15, where it provides that the bonds shall be paid, principal and interest, in gold.

Mr. STEWART. Very well.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator from Nevada will take one place, it will do just as well as taking half a dozen places in the bill.

Mr. STEWART. I will adopt the Senator's suggestion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada withdraws his proposed amendment and offers another, as the Chair understands.

Mr. TELLER. I make this suggestion to the Senator. In section 6, on page 15, beginning in line 3, the bill reads:

Such bonds to be payable at the pleasure of the United States after thirty years from the date of their issue, and said bonds to be payable, principal and interest, in gold coin of the present standard value.

If the Senator moves to strike out the words "in gold coin of the present standard value," he will be able to accomplish what he desires.

Mr. STEWART. I propose to do that; and to insert "gold or silver coin of the standard value of July 14, 1870."

Mr. TELLER. It seems to me the Senator can get a vote on that without any further trouble.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I only want to say that if there were a proposition in this bill to make the existing bonds of the United States now outstanding payable in gold coin alone, I should vote against it; but this is a proposition to issue new 2 per cent bonds, into which the whole public debt is to be voluntarily funded; and, as I have said before, I am willing to vote for that if we can fund our national debt now existing into new 2 per cent gold bonds. I call the attention of the Senator from Nevada to the fact that these bonds could not be negotiated if they were not gold bonds. Therefore the Senator can accomplish what he wants in a much easier way by joining me in voting against the whole bill. That is the easiest way to do it.

Mr. ALLISON. I am afraid the Senator from Nevada has not heard the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire, that he join the Senator from New Hampshire in voting against the bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the Senator from Nevada had better withdraw his amendment.

Mr. STEWART. No.

Mr. ALDRICH. Perhaps it would simplify matters if I moved to lay the amendment, whatever it is, on the table.

Mr. STEWART. Let the amendment be first read.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. STEWART. Wait until it is read, will you, please?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART].

The SECRETARY. In section 6, on page 15, line 5, after the word "interest," it is proposed to strike out "in gold coin of the pres-

ent standard value" and insert "in coin of standard value of the act of July 14, 1870."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island moves to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do.

Mr. STEWART. I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HEITFELD (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER].

Mr. WETMORE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER], who is absent, and I understand is not paired. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. COCKRELL. I want to announce that my colleague [Mr. VEST], who was unavoidably called from the Senate Chamber a few moments ago, is paired with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON]. My colleague, if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. NELSON (after having voted in the affirmative). When I voted I supposed the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] was present. I withdraw my vote.

Mr. TELLER. I want again to announce the absence of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] on account of sickness and to say that if present, he would vote "nay" on this motion. I will also announce that he is against this bill and, if present, would vote against the bill and all amendments coming from the committee.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 26; as follows:

YEAS—44.

Aldrich,	Depew,	Kean,	Pritchard,
Allison,	Elkins,	Lindsay,	Quarles,
Beveridge,	Fairbanks,	Lodge,	Ross,
Burrows,	Foraker,	McBride,	Scott,
Caffery,	Foster,	McComas,	Sewell,
Carter,	Frye,	McCumber,	Shoup,
Chandler,	Gear,	McMillan,	Simon,
Clark, Wyo.	Hanna,	Mason,	Spooner,
Cullom,	Hansbrough,	Penrose,	Thurston,
Davis,	Hawley,	Perkins,	Wetmore,
Deboe,	Hoar,	Platt, Conn.	Wolcott.

NAYS—26.

Bate,	Culberson,	McLaurin,	Sullivan,
Berry,	Daniel,	Martin,	Taliaferro,
Butler,	Harris,	Money,	Teller,
Chilton,	Jones, Ark.	Morgan,	Tillman,
Clark, Mont.	Jones, Nev.	Pettus,	Turley.
Clay,	Kenney,	Rawlins,	
Cockrell,	McEnery,	Stewart,	

NOT VOTING—16.

Allen,	Hale,	Nelson,	Turner,
Bacon,	Heitfeld,	Pettigrew,	Vest,
Baker,	Kyle,	Platt, N. Y.	Warren,
Gallinger,	Mallory,	Proctor,	Wellington.

So Mr. STEWART's amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. PETTUS. I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the amendment of the committee by inserting at the end of section 1 the following:

Gold coins and silver dollars coined by the United States shall be a legal tender in all payments at their nominal value when not below the weight and limit of tolerance provided by law for the single coin, and when reduced in weight below such standard and tolerance shall be a legal tender at valuation in proportion to their actual weight.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to lay that amendment upon the table.

Mr. PETTUS. Why not have a direct vote upon the amendment?

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no objection to a direct vote upon the amendment, if the Senator prefers that course.

Mr. PETTUS. I do; and I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HEITFELD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WETMORE (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], and transfer that pair to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER], who is absent. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WARREN. I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER].

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 44; as follows:

YEAS—27.			
Bate,	Culberson,	McLaurin,	Sullivan,
Berry,	Daniel,	Martin,	Taliaferro,
Butler,	Harris,	Money,	Teller,
Chilton,	Jones, Ark.	Morgan,	Tillman,
Clark, Mont.	Jones, Nev.	Pettus,	Turley,
Clay,	Kenney,	Rawlins,	Vest.
Cockrell,	McEnery,	Stewart,	
NAYS—44.			
Aldrich,	Depew,	Lindsay,	Pritchard,
Allison,	Elkins,	Lodge,	Quarles,
Beveridge,	Fairbanks,	McBride,	Ross,
Burrows,	Foraker,	McComas,	Scott,
Caffery,	Foster,	McCumber,	Sewell,
Carter,	Gear,	McMillan,	Shoup,
Chandler,	Hanna,	Mason,	Simon,
Clark, Wyo.	Hansbrough,	Nelson,	Spooner,
Cullom,	Hawley,	Penrose,	Thurston,
Davis,	Hoar,	Perkins,	Wetmore,
Deboe,	Kean,	Platt, Conn.	Wolcott.
NOT VOTING—15.			
Allen,	Gallinger,	Mallory,	Turner,
Bacon,	Hale,	Pettigrew,	Warren,
Baker,	Heitfeld,	Platt, N. Y.	Wellington.
Frye,	Kyle,	Proctor,	

So Mr. PETTUS's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PETTUS. I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert at the end of the bill as a separate section the following:

SEC. —. That nothing contained in this act shall be held or construed to affect the present legal-tender quality of silver dollars coined by the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PETTUS], which has just been read. [Putting the question.] The "nays" appear to prevail.

Mr. PETTUS. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HEITFELD (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY].

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER].

Mr. WETMORE (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], and that that pair has been transferred to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER], who is absent. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire whether the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have a general pair with that Senator, and so I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 44; as follows:

YEAS—26.			
Bate,	Culberson,	Martin,	Taliaferro,
Berry,	Daniel,	Money,	Teller,
Butler,	Harris,	Morgan,	Tillman,
Chilton,	Jones, Nev.	Pettus,	Turley,
Clark, Mont.	Kenney,	Rawlins,	Vest.
Clay,	McEnery,	Stewart,	
Cockrell,	McLaurin,	Sullivan,	
NAYS—44.			
Aldrich,	Depew,	Kean,	Platt, Conn.
Allison,	Elkins,	Lindsay,	Quarles,
Beveridge,	Fairbanks,	Lodge,	Ross,
Burrows,	Foraker,	McBride,	Scott,
Caffery,	Foster,	McComas,	Sewell,
Carter,	Frye,	McCumber,	Shoup,
Chandler,	Gear,	McMillan,	Simon,
Clark, Wyo.	Hanna,	Mason,	Spooner,
Cullom,	Hansbrough,	Nelson,	Thurston,
Davis,	Hawley,	Penrose,	Wetmore,
Deboe,	Hoar,	Perkins,	Wolcott.
NOT VOTING—14.			
Allen,	Hale,	Mallory,	Proctor,
Bacon,	Heitfeld,	Pettigrew,	Turner,
Baker,	Jones, Ark.	Platt, N. Y.	Warren,
Gallinger,	Kyle,	Pritchard,	Wellington.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VEST. I offer an amendment, and ask the Secretary to read it from the copy which I send to the desk, as by some clerical error two or three words were omitted in the print.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of section 7 the following:

Provided further, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be prepared Treasury notes to the amount of \$300,000,000, said notes to be in such form and denomination as the Secretary may determine, and to be full legal

tender for all debts, public and private. The Secretary shall cause to be engraved upon each of said notes the words "bond note" and the statement that said note is a full legal tender, as aforesaid; and he shall loan, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, said notes to any person, persons, or corporation in sums not less than \$100 on their depositing in the United States Treasury United States bonds at par value and in sums equal to the amount of bond Treasury notes issued to such applicant or applicants; said bond Treasury notes so issued shall bear the same rate of interest as the bonds upon which they are issued, and said bonds so deposited with the Treasury shall only be redeemed by the original depositors of the same or their assigns by surrendering to the Treasury bond Treasury notes or other legal-tender money of the United States of equal amount with the par value of said bonds and accrued interest.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, if the Senate will indulge me for a very few moments, I should like to say something about this amendment, though I frankly state that I am not very sanguine as to its adoption.

The obvious meaning of this amendment is to place all the citizens of the United States upon the same footing as the national banks as to drawing currency out of the Treasury upon the deposit of bonds. There are some good features in the national banking system, amongst which are the double-liability clause as to stockholders and the examination of the banks periodically; but I have always objected to that feature which gave to those institutions the right to contract or expand the currency of the country at pleasure.

It has seemed to me always that that was a dangerous power, and I think that our experience in the past justifies my apprehension. It is now an open secret that three or four of the great banks in the city of New York control the stock market and the prices of all securities. They can expand or they can contract the currency at their pleasure. They can go to the Treasury and put in their bonds, upon which they are drawing interest, take out money, and loan it to the people of the country at 6 percent or more. If, upon the other hand, they want to contract the currency, they simply retire their notes and take out bonds, the interest still continuing to run in their favor.

Now, what is this, I ask in all sincerity and candor, except a moneyed monopoly of the most dangerous character? I have no personal antipathy to banks or capital; I have no desire to pull down the wealthy classes in the country, if legitimately wealthy. But human nature is the same everywhere and under all circumstances. When you put the power in the hands of any lot of directors, I care not how high their standing or charming their personality, to contract or expand the currency of a great country, it is a dangerous gift; and I am compelled to say it will always be excused. When I say excused, I mean to say they will always have the influence to make it appear to the people that what they are doing in regard to contraction or expansion is entirely legitimate and proper.

Mr. President, I intend to make some statements, in none of which I have the slightest personal feeling and in none of which shall I indulge in any criticism that is not entirely proper as to a public official in regard to his official acts. Two years after I entered the Senate of the United States—in 1881—we had an object lesson in regard to national banks which will never be forgotten. It was proposed in Congress to fund the bonded debt of the country at 3 per cent and to make the new bonds the only basis for bank circulation. It aroused the deepest resentment on the part of the banks. It cut down the interest upon their bonds and compelled them to take, at a smaller interest and as a basis for circulation, the 3 percents. Those of us who were here then will remember that these corridors swarmed with bank officers.

They came from my own State and said to me personally, "If Congress dares to pass this bill," which they denominated as robbery, "it will cause a panic in this country which will shake the entire monetary system to the center." The great bankers of New York, as they always do, led the attack upon Congress. Millions and hundreds of millions of dollars were represented around this Capitol. They said, "The idea of cutting down the interest on our bonds and forcing us to make these the basis of circulation is a felony. You dare to do it, and we will create a panic in Wall street, the effects of which will not be recovered from in years."

I am glad to say that Congress for once stood firm against these assaults, and we passed the bill. Hayes was then President and ex-Senator Sherman Secretary of the Treasury, and in one hour after that bill was passed stocks fell 40 per cent in Wall street and some of them went down to even a lower price. They made good their threat. Then the President of the United States, with the full concurrence, of course, of the Secretary, vetoed the bill, and we were unable to pass it over his veto. I have here, but I will not detain the Senate by reading it, the veto message of President Hayes in which he declared that the national banking system was the most perfect ever created by the genius of mortal man and that to pass this bill—the bill then pending—was to destroy the system, and he therefore felt it his solemn duty to interpose the Executive veto.

The bill failed, but under the Administration of President Harrison Secretary of the Treasury Windom funded the debt at three

and a half per cent, one-half per cent more than we had put in the bill which was vetoed by Hayes, and there was not the slightest trouble throughout the country. My colleague calls my attention to something I have not mentioned, that on the day after the bill passed the banks retired eighteen millions of circulation in order to assist the panic which was then going on, and which affected the credit of the entire country and ruined hundreds and thousands of innocent people.

Mr. President, I came to the conclusion then that in a republican government, looking to the welfare of the entire people, no such tremendous power as this should be given to any men or any corporations. I have had additional reasons since for entertaining that opinion.

Now, I am not talking about these banks in any spirit of hypercriticism, for I have mentioned the fact that there are some good features in their organization. I take it for granted that no Senator here will for an instant pretend that any individual or any corporation in this country should be permitted to violate the law. That ought to be axiomatic. Under the national banking law a national bank, declared by the Supreme Court to be a fiscal agent of the Government, should have its doors closed the minute it refuses to pay out to a depositor his money in its vaults. If a country bank, with a capital of fifty thousand or a hundred thousand dollars, should refuse to pay my check for \$5 and I had that much money in its vaults, it would be closed by telegraph from the city of Washington and put into the hands of a receiver. All the world knows it. In 1890, when the Baring Brothers failed, and in 1893, in that awful panic which shook the country all over, the great banks of New York City, with millions of dollars of deposits belonging to individuals, continued to do business, and yet refused to pay out one dollar in money to their depositors except as a matter of the highest personal favor, *ex gratia*.

I had friends in the city of New York who told me that they had thousands of dollars in those banks and when they would apply for money to defray their ordinary family expenses they were coolly told, "You can have clearing-house certificates, but not one dollar in currency or in gold or silver." That state of things continued for three weeks openly, notoriously, and flagrantly, in violation of the law, well known to the officers of the Government, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Secretary of the Treasury. No bank was closed. They stood there, monumental violators of the statute, with perfect impunity, and sneered at the idea that they could be closed because they refused to obey the national-banking law. Will any Senator here deny that? Can a system be right in any country, but especially in a popular Government like ours, which permits this sort of thing openly and notoriously and almost in sight of the Capitol?

But, Mr. President, I come now to a third phase of this question, which I speak of with great reluctance. I have come to that age of life and of public life when I know how easy it is to criticize a public man. It is hardly necessary for me to say that I have suffered from that sort of thing myself. If one-tenth of what has been said of me in my public life is true I ought to be in a felon's cell, and there is hardly a Senator in this body who is not in the same condition. I am no boy to be using loose words in regard to the character of men, publicly or privately. But we are all justly and legitimately subject to the criticism that must affect everybody in public life. I have the kindest feeling personally for Mr. Gage, but I have read with very great attention and reread his answer to the resolutions passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate in regard to the recent transactions with national banks and national depositories. I am compelled to say, Mr. President, that that answer of the Secretary of the Treasury is unsatisfactory. I have been unable to understand why the Secretary of the Treasury should choose the City National Bank of New York as the distributing agency of the public money.

Mr. Gage says that he desired, in putting the money into the public depositories from time to time, to prevent congestion in the Treasury of the United States and injury to the business of the country. With that I have no quarrel. But why does he take one national bank, even if it did have more bonds than any other on deposit in the Treasury, for the purpose of distributing to other banks the tax money of the people? Mr. Gage disposes of that question by saying that it was impracticable to use the subtreasury in the city of New York as a distributing agency. Why? Were not the vaults of that institution secure? Did it not have sufficient clerical force? Was it inaccessible to the public? Did it have no facilities for sending money to national banks? It was due to the people of the United States and the representatives of the people that Mr. Gage should say specifically and in detail what created these difficulties as to choosing the subtreasury in New York for the distribution of this large amount of money. When Mr. Gage received \$58,000,000 from the close of the Pacific Railroad transaction he said it was inexpedient to put this large amount of money in the Treasury. Therefore he looked around for some distributing agency, when he had his own subtreasury

in New York with every facility, as it must have had, for the distribution of this money.

Mr. President, it was not so much the money that was put into the bank that constituted this favoritism. It was the unparalleled fact that a national bank was selected to represent the Treasury of the United States. What must have been the advantage to that institution when Mr. Gage, representing the whole Government, said to all the world, "Here is a national bank that I prefer to the Treasury itself to distribute this money to other banks." Mr. Gage says no national bank charges for its services. What greater pay could it have than this? There it stands to-day, the elected agent of the greatest Government on earth, indorsed as to credit and reliability in such fashion as has never happened before.

When we were called upon under the treaty of Paris to pay \$20,000,000 to Spain this bank appeared and said, as the correspondence shows, "We should like very much to handle this transaction for the Government. We have great facilities at Hongkong, and we should like to transmit this money;" because the bank knew that the fact that it was intrusted with the transmission of this enormous amount of money would be an advertisement in Europe and in this country which could not be bought with money. They did transmit the \$20,000,000. Is it possible that a draft on the City National Bank of New York was worth more in Spain or anywhere else than a draft on the Treasury of the United States? The mere statement of the proposition furnishes an answer.

But, Mr. President, the Secretary of the Treasury does not answer the inquiry of Congress satisfactorily, to me at least, in regard to the sale and leasing of the old custom-house in the city of New York. Under the terms of the law by which that sale was made the old site was to be put up to the highest and best bidder, and the City National Bank, Mr. Gage said, and I have no doubt it was the fact, was the highest and best bidder. All the purchase money could be paid down or \$750,000 paid and the balance at certain times thereafter within a certain limit, as suited the purchaser. Three million two hundred and fifteen thousand dollars were left due, and that amount of money was left without any interest in the hands of the bank to be loaned to the people of the United States at interest. Mr. Gage says in his answer to the inquiry of Congress that no money was paid by the Government to the bank under the provision of the law which required the purchaser of the old custom-house to lease the building to the Government at a reasonable rent until a new custom-house could be erected. Mr. Gage states that no money was paid because Congress had made no appropriation to pay that rent.

Mr. President, the question that ought to have been answered by the Secretary of the Treasury is, What were the terms of that lease? Was there interest to be paid? Under what conditions did that lease go into effect? All the world knows that when the United States Government made that lease there must have been some terms not stated in the reply of Mr. Gage to the resolution of Congress. What sort of transaction was this in which the purchase money was left in the hands of the purchaser without interest, no deed put upon record, which exempted the property as United States property from the State and city tax in the State and city of New York? Why is it we are told coolly and deliberately that no money was paid by the Government, because no appropriation was made by Congress? The bank had the money in their vaults, and why should they require the cash to be paid down by the Government when they already had control of it?

Mr. President, not only this, but when Mr. Gage speaks of the bonds that the bank deposited to qualify, to use his expression, as a national depository, the correspondence shows that those bonds came from the Standard Oil Company, whose officers and stockholders are also stockholders of the City National Bank of New York. We find in this correspondence letter after letter from the City National Bank to the Secretary of the Treasury saying please transmit to the Standard Oil Company a million five hundred thousand dollars in bonds, or \$2,000,000 in bonds, showing that as the bank needed bonds in order to get money out of the Treasury of the United States they applied to the Standard Oil Company and received bonds, which as a matter of course were afterwards returned when they had no further use for them.

Mr. President, a letter was written which has been alluded to here, and which will be alluded to very frequently in the coming campaign of course, from Mr. Hepburn, the vice-president of the bank, in which he said to the Secretary of the Treasury, "We desire to be continued as a national depository. If you will look at the list of our directors you will see how efficient was their aid in the last canvass." What was this statement except a naked, bare-faced demand for official favors because favors in the recent campaign had been conferred upon the Administration by this great bank? Is that a proper condition of things? I submit to every man in this Chamber and outside of it, who wishes fairly and deliberately to consider this question, was that letter short of an insult to the highest fiscal officer of this Government when it says in words hardly veiled, "We helped you; now you must help us?"

Mr. President, this amendment simply puts it within the power

of any individual citizen of the United States to take his bonds, carry them to the Treasury, deposit them, and draw out an equal amount of these Treasury notes, no interest to run upon the bonds while they are so deposited, when under the existing law and under this bill the national banks have the privilege of depositing their bonds, interest still running, and taking out the currency which they loan to their customers at 6 per cent or more.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair very reluctantly calls the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the fact that his time has expired.

Mr. VEST. I will not trespass any longer upon the time of the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I venture to suggest to my friend, the Senator from Missouri, that the amendment as printed is not correct.

Mr. VEST. I corrected that. It is a misprint.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. There are two or three other objections which I see to this.

Mr. President, there is not a civilized country in the world engaged in large commercial transactions where there is not some sort of provision somewhere to meet an emergency in the case of a panic, except in the United States. And there is nothing here. The idea presented by the Senator from Missouri is worthy of consideration, in my opinion. It ought to be carefully considered by the Senate. We all understand conditions in this country, that when a crisis begins there is a tendency to hold money everywhere; and if there should be a deliberate conspiracy to corner money, to bring on a panic, the people are practically helpless and have no means of preventing or checking it. We heard only a few weeks ago when there was danger of a panic in New York that it was prevented by the Treasury sending a considerable amount of money and by certain individuals advancing money that went into the market and checked the panic.

Now, this proposition of the Senator from Missouri, as I understand it, is intended to be about this: That persons who own bonds may deposit them in the Treasury and be allowed to take out an equivalent amount of money in cases where they need it; that the money taken or borrowed from the Government on the bonds shall pay a rate of interest equal to the interest which the Government pays on the bonds while the money is in the hands of the persons borrowing the money on the bonds. It simply provides a means by which a holder of United States bonds may be able to get money on those bonds when there is an emergency and he can not get it at the banks, a condition that has existed a number of times here.

It is useless to go into a discussion of the conditions that prevail in England or France or Germany to provide for funds in an emergency. If this proposition of the Senator from Missouri is not in proper form, and I confess there are some points as to which I object, it can be corrected. For instance, I do not think there is a necessity for having \$200,000,000 put in this fund. I think \$50,000,000 would be quite enough. But I do believe it would be a wise provision to put \$50,000,000 of money in the Treasury, which could be taken out of the Treasury by the holders of United States bonds, on depositing ample security for the Government, and kept for a reasonable time.

I had myself proposed an amendment, which has been printed and which I thought would reach the case better, and that proposed that 6 per cent should be paid on this money by the borrowers and that they should be required to return it to the Treasury within twelve months of the time it was borrowed, so as to tide over an emergency. I can see no reason why it should not be done. I am sure the Senator from Missouri did not mean to say, as the amendment does, on page 2, after providing for the bonds at par value—

In sums equal to the amount of bond Treasury notes issued to such applicants or applicants; said bond Treasury notes so issued shall bear the same rate of interest as the bonds upon which they are issued.

Now, this is evidently a misprint or a mistake in the structure, as the Senator from Missouri did not intend to have the Government pay interest on the bonds and at the same time pay interest on the money borrowed on the bonds. What he meant was that the interest on the bonds should stop while the money was in the hands of the men who took it out of the Treasury Department, but he intended to express it by saying the borrower of the money should pay the same rate of interest on the money that he gets on the bonds, which is the same thing. It was clearly, I take it, not the intention to make the Government pay double interest—interest on the bonds and interest on the Treasury notes.

Mr. VEST. I did not mean that.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I hope we will now have a vote on this amendment.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. President, this amendment provides that notes issued by the Secretary of the Treasury up to \$200,000,000, and loaned on the bonds, shall be a full legal tender for all debts, public and private, yet, so far as I observe, there is no provision made for the redemption of this money at all in coin of any kind.

The provision is that these notes "shall only be redeemed by the original depositors of the same, or their assigns, by surrendering to the Treasury bond Treasury notes or other legal-tender money of the United States of equal amount with the par value of said bonds and accrued interest."

The point I make is whether it is not a departure from any legislation we have ever had that we shall issue demand notes not redeemable at all in any kind of coin and make those notes legal tender for all debts, public and private. If the Government shall make them a legal tender in payment of public dues and debts, it is all very well; but to make these irredeemable notes, so far as coin is concerned, legal tender in payment of private debts is, I think, a step further than has ever been gone by any legislation.

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator permit me? My idea was that these Treasury notes should be redeemable exactly as the Treasury notes that we have already issued. But the Senator can obviate any question about it, if he makes any objection to it, by saying redeemable in coin, like the Treasury notes. I certainly meant that they were to be so redeemed.

Mr. LINDSAY. There is no description of these notes that would warrant the inference that they are to be redeemed at the Treasury in either gold or silver:

That the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be prepared Treasury notes to the amount of \$200,000,000, said notes to be in such form and denomination as the Secretary may determine, and to be full legal tender for all debts, public and private. The Secretary shall cause to be engraved upon each of said notes the words "bond note" and the statement that said note is a full legal tender, as aforesaid; and he shall loan, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, said notes to any person, etc.

I am impressed with the conviction that some legislation in this direction is not only proper but probably necessary, but I do not think, with due deference to the Senator from Missouri, that this amendment ought to be made a part of the bill, which evidently will become a law before the end of the present session.

Mr. CAFFERY. It may be, Mr. President, that the Senator from Missouri intended that the obligation of the Government set out in the bill to maintain all its issues of money at a parity would cover the redemption of these notes that he proposed to issue upon the deposit of bonds. But it occurs to me that this adds to the evil that already cries for remedy. We have too much paper money issued by the Government now, and to add to that paper money by \$200,000,000 would produce too much additional strain upon the \$150,000,000 of reserve provided for in the bill.

I could wish, Mr. President, that this bill had provided at least for the beginning of a system of banking which would divorce the United States from any connection whatever with its own bonds as the redemption fund of bank notes. I believe that a healthy system of banking ought to be commenced now in this bill, and that that system of banking should contain, as the redemption fund of the notes, whatever coin money the United States issued.

One of the evils of the present banking system, as the Senator from Iowa well knows, is the tendency to congest all money in the city of New York. Ordinarily the country banks deposit their reserves and deposits in the reserve cities, which in turn deposit them in New York. In times of stringency they would draw that deposit, and the very moment when the country needs currency in a financial or industrial panic, that is the time when no currency can be had. At all other periods money is abundant in New York. A very large portion of the money of the United States is there seeking investment and loan. When the country is prosperous New York has an abundance of money to loan, and when there is a panic it has none.

So, therefore, I think that a system of banking ought to be inaugurated whereby the wealth of each community would afford a basis for such an issue of notes in every financial panic as would tide over the difficulty. There will never be any elasticity in the currency, in my opinion, until the banking system is entirely reformed and gold and silver are made the redemption fund of all issues of banks; in other words, until we go back to the ancient method, the true method, the sound method that prevailed in sound banks before the war.

As a matter of course, as at present, to have uniform Federal supervision of the banks is necessary. I do not know but that State banks chartered by the States themselves, with power to issue money, with this provision of uniformity and regulation by the Government retained, without Federal supervision, would be preferable to the present system now in vogue. I believe it would; but so far as this particular amendment is concerned I am utterly opposed to adding anything more to the burden that the United States is now compelled to bear in the way of redeeming its issues of money and providing an enormous reserve for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to the text of the bill?

Mr. McLAURIN. I desire to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill add as a new section the following:

SEC. 9. That sections 3412 and 3413 and all other acts and parts of acts which impose any tax upon the circulation of State banks or State banking associations be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

Mr. McLAURIN. I call for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY].

Mr. SULLIVAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON], and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER].

Mr. WETMORE (when his name was called). I again announce the transfer of my pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER], and I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BATE (after having voted in the affirmative). I wish to ask whether the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. DEBOE] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky has not voted.

Mr. BATE. I promised to take care of him on this vote on this particular occasion, and I will withdraw my vote. I do not know how he would vote. I should vote "yea" if he were present.

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 47; as follows:

YEAS—20.

Berry,
Chilton,
Clark, Mont.
Clay,
Culberson,

Daniel,
Heitfeld,
Jones, Ark.
Lindsay,
McEnery,

McLaurin,
Martin,
Money,
Morgan,
Pettus,

Rawlins,
Taliaferro,
Tillman,
Turley,
Vest.

NAYS—47.

Aldrich,
Allison,
Beveridge,
Burrows,
Caffery,
Carter,
Chandler,
Clark, Wyo.
Cullom,
Davis,
Depew,
Elkins,

Fairbanks,
Foraker,
Foster,
Frye,
Gear,
Hale,
Hanna,
Hansbrough,
Harris,
Hawley,
Hoar,
Jones, Nev.

Kean,
Lodge,
McBride,
McComas,
McCumber,
McMillan,
Nelson,
Perkins,
Platt, Conn.
Platt, N. Y.
Pritchard,
Quarles,

Ross,
Scott,
Sewell,
Shoup,
Simon,
Spooner,
Stewart,
Teller,
Thurston,
Wetmore,
Wolcott.

NOT VOTING—19.

Allen,
Bacon,
Baker,
Bate,
Butler,

Cockrell,
Deboe,
Gallinger,
Kenney,
Kyle,

Mallory,
Mason,
Penrose,
Pettigrew,
Proctor,

Sullivan,
Turner,
Warren,
Wellington.

So the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to the text of the committee amendment? If not, the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] is in order, which is proposed as a substitute for the entire amendment. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

First. That it is the fixed policy of the United States to pay and clear off the national debt as rapidly as just and equal taxation and the accumulation of other revenues of the Government will permit, with constant regard to the capacity of the people to respond to this national duty.

Second. That the specie basis, consisting of gold and silver coin, is the only true, just, and constitutional basis of the issue of bank bills to circulate as money.

Third. That it is an unjust and unconstitutional burden on the taxpayers of the United States that Congress should agree to change the terms of the national obligations, even with the consent of the bondholders, so as to deprive the people of the right and privilege of paying said obligations in coins of gold or silver according to their necessities or the requirements of the general welfare.

Fourth. That it is contrary to the policy of the United States that the national debt shall be made perpetual, or that it should be maintained or increased for the benefit of the national banks, or to regulate the commercial value of gold or silver bullion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY] to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON], and vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER].

Mr. WETMORE (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER], and vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 27, nays 47; as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bate,
Berry,
Chilton,
Clark, Mont.
Clay,
Cockrell,
Culberson,

Daniel,
Harris,
Heitfeld,
Jones, Ark.
Jones, Nev.
Kenney,
McEnery,

McLaurin,
Martin,
Money,
Morgan,
Pettus,
Rawlins,
Stewart,

Sullivan,
Taliaferro,
Teller,
Tillman,
Turley,
Vest.

NAYS—47.

Aldrich,
Allison,
Beveridge,
Burrows,
Caffery,
Carter,
Chandler,
Clark, Wyo.
Cullom,
Davis,
Deboe,
Depew,

Elkins,
Fairbanks,
Foraker,
Foster,
Frye,
Gear,
Hale,
Hanna,
Hansbrough,
Hawley,
Hoar,
Kean,

Lindsay,
Lodge,
McBride,
McComas,
McCumber,
McMillan,
Nelson,
Penrose,
Perkins,
Platt, Conn.
Platt, N. Y.
Pritchard,

Proctor,
Quarles,
Ross,
Scott,
Sewell,
Shoup,
Simon,
Spooner,
Thurston,
Wetmore,
Wolcott.

NOT VOTING—12.

Allen,
Bacon,
Baker,

Butler,
Gallinger,
Kyle,

Mallory,
Mason,
Pettigrew,

Turner,
Warren,
Wellington.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas offers an amendment, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That from and after the passage of this act the mints of the United States shall be open to the coinage of silver, and there shall be coined dollars of the weight of 412½ grains troy, of standard silver, nine-tenths fine, as provided by the act of January 18, 1837, and upon the same terms and subject to the limitations and provisions of law regulating the coinage and legal-tender quality of gold; and whenever the said coins herein provided for shall be received into the Treasury certificates may be issued therefor in the manner now provided by law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ALDRICH and Mr. BERRY called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY].

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER].

Mr. WETMORE (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] and the transfer of that pair to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER]. I vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 28, nays 47; as follows:

YEAS—28.

Bate,
Berry,
Butler,
Chilton,
Clark, Mont.
Clay,
Cockrell,

Culberson,
Daniel,
Harris,
Heitfeld,
Jones, Ark.
Jones, Nev.
Kenney,

McEnery,
McLaurin,
Martin,
Money,
Morgan,
Pettus,
Rawlins,

Stewart,
Sullivan,
Taliaferro,
Teller,
Tillman,
Turley,
Vest.

NAYS—47.

Aldrich,
Allison,
Beveridge,
Burrows,
Caffery,
Carter,
Chandler,
Clark, Wyo.
Cullom,
Davis,
Deboe,
Depew,

Elkins,
Fairbanks,
Foraker,
Foster,
Frye,
Gear,
Hale,
Hanna,
Hansbrough,
Hawley,
Hoar,
Kean,

Lindsay,
Lodge,
McBride,
McComas,
McCumber,
McMillan,
Mason,
Nelson,
Penrose,
Perkins,
Platt, Conn.
Platt, N. Y.

Pritchard,
Quarles,
Ross,
Scott,
Sewell,
Shoup,
Simon,
Spooner,
Thurston,
Wetmore,
Wolcott.

NOT VOTING—11.

Allen,
Bacon,
Baker,

Gallinger,
Kyle,
Mallory,

Pettigrew,
Proctor,
Turner,

Warren,
Wellington.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUTLER. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from North Carolina will be stated.

Mr. ALDRICH. The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina is a very elaborate bill, proposing a new system of finance in the United States. I suggest that it be printed in the RECORD and acted upon without being read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island asks unanimous consent that the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] be printed in the RECORD without reading. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER. That is satisfactory to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and that order will be made.

The amendment proposed by Mr. BUTLER was to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill and to insert:

That the unit of account shall be dollar, and the fractional parts thereof shall be cent and mill; the cent shall be the one-hundredth part of a dollar, or unit, and the mill shall be the one-thousandth part of a dollar, or unit; and that all the accounts of the Government and of the public offices thereof and all the proceedings in the courts of the United States shall be kept and stated in such unit and fractional parts thereof, namely, dollars, cents, and mills.

SEC. 2. That the money of the United States shall be manufactured or coined out of gold, silver, paper, or copper. The gold coins shall be manufactured out of an alloy of which nine parts by weight shall be pure gold and one part by weight shall be copper or copper and silver, and shall be known as standard gold. The silver coins shall be manufactured or coined out of an alloy of which nine parts by weight shall be pure silver and one part by weight shall be copper, and shall be known as standard silver. The copper or minor coins shall be manufactured or coined out of an alloy of which three parts by weight shall be copper and one part by weight shall be nickel. The paper money or units shall be manufactured or coined out of paper, the character and quality of which shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 3. That no piece of money coined or manufactured out of gold, silver, or paper shall be greater than twenty dollars or units, and each piece of money manufactured by the United States out of gold, silver, or paper shall be a legal tender for all debts, public and private, at their nominal or face value. The minor coins shall be a legal tender at their nominal or face value for all debts, public and private, in amounts not to exceed one dollar or unit in any single payment.

SEC. 4. That there shall be manufactured or coined out of standard gold the following coins or pieces of money, namely: Twenty dollar or unit pieces, each to be twenty dollars or units, and to contain 516 grains, troy; ten dollar or unit pieces, each to be ten dollars or units, and to contain 258 grains, troy; five dollar or unit pieces, each to be five dollars or units, and to contain 129 grains, troy.

SEC. 5. That there shall be manufactured or coined out of standard silver the following coins or pieces of money, namely: Dollar or unit pieces, each to be one dollar or unit, and to contain 412 grains, troy; one-half dollar or unit pieces, each to be one-half of a dollar or unit, and to contain 206 grains, troy; quarter dollar or unit pieces, each to be one-quarter of a dollar or unit, and to contain 103 grains, troy; dimes, each to be one-tenth of a dollar or unit, and to contain 41 grains, troy.

SEC. 6. That the minor coins of the United States shall be a 5-cent piece and a 1-cent piece. The 5-cent piece shall be the one-twentieth part of a dollar or unit, and shall contain 80 grains, troy; the 1-cent piece shall be the one-hundredth part of a dollar or unit, and shall contain 40 grains, troy.

SEC. 7. That any person may bring to the mints of the United States gold or silver bullion to be coined into money, and the same shall be coined into money for him free of charge immediately upon receipt of the same at the mint, and into pieces of such denominations as he may designate, and if he fail to inform the Director of the Mint at the time his bullion is received at the mint what denominations he desires his bullion to be coined into, the same shall be coined into such pieces as the Director of the Mint may direct. All gold and silver bullion which is now owned by, or which may hereafter come into the possession of, the United States, shall be immediately coined into money.

SEC. 8. That the minor coins shall be coined out of material purchased by the Director of the Mint with funds appropriated for that purpose, and the same shall be delivered to any person or persons who may purchase the same of the Government at their nominal or face value.

SEC. 9. That no coins other than those provided for in this act shall hereafter be manufactured at the mint to be used for money in the United States.

SEC. 10. That upon the coins that shall be coined hereafter at the mint the following devices and legends, and none other, shall be stamped or printed, namely: Upon the obverse side an impression emblematic of liberty, with an inscription of the word "Liberty" and the year of the coinage, and upon the reverse side the figure or representation of an eagle, with the inscriptions "United States of America" and "E Pluribus Unum," and the designation of the number of dollars or units or parts of a dollar or unit of the coin; as, for example, \$20 or units, dollar or unit, or half dollar or unit, as the case may be; but the figure of the eagle shall be omitted from the 10-cent piece. The minor coins shall bear the same inscriptions as the other coins, except the eagle shall be omitted, and each piece shall be designated as 5 cents or 1 cent, as the case may be.

SEC. 11. That there shall be manufactured or coined out of paper, at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the United States, the following kinds or pieces of money, and none other, namely, twenty-dollar or unit pieces, each to be twenty dollars or units; ten-dollar or unit pieces, each to be ten dollars or units; five-dollar or unit pieces, each to be five dollars or units; two-dollar or unit pieces, each to be two dollars or units; one-dollar or unit pieces, each to be one dollar or unit.

SEC. 12. That upon the obverse side of each piece of paper money that shall be coined under this act the following devices or legends shall be printed or stamped, namely, the denomination expressed in numerals, the serial number (and each denomination shall be numbered separately) commencing with the number 1; the respective signatures of the Secretary and Registrar of the Treasury; the year of the coinage; the words "United States of America" and "E Pluribus Unum" and an impression of the Goddess of Liberty, with the word "Liberty" beneath it. Upon the obverse and reverse sides of each piece shall be printed or stamped the words "A legal tender for all debts, public and private," and across both sides the denomination thereof expressed in words, as, for example, "Twenty dollars or units" or "Dollar or unit," as the case may be. Upon the obverse side of each twenty-dollar or unit piece shall be stamped a vignette of George Washington, beneath which shall be printed or stamped the words "George Washington, first President of the United States." Upon the obverse side of each ten-dollar or unit piece shall be stamped a vignette of Andrew Jackson, beneath which shall be printed or stamped the words "Andrew Jackson, seventh President of the United States." Upon the obverse side of each five-dollar or unit piece shall be stamped a vignette of Abraham Lincoln, beneath which shall be printed or stamped the words "Abraham Lincoln, sixteenth President of the United States." Upon the obverse side of each two-dollar or unit piece shall be printed or stamped a vignette of Thomas Jefferson, beneath which shall be printed or stamped the words "Thomas Jefferson, third President of the United States." Upon the obverse side of each one-dollar or unit piece shall be printed or stamped a vignette of Benjamin Franklin, beneath which shall be printed or stamped the words "Benjamin Franklin, one of the first advocates of paper money." Such other devices and printing may be placed upon each piece of paper money coined under this act for the purpose of des-

ignating it from other pieces, and which may be pertinent for that purpose, as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 13. That plates shall be engraved under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of printing or coining the various denominations of money out of paper as herein provided for. The engraving and the printing shall be of the highest art, and the paper shall be of the best character and quality that can be obtained for that purpose. The pieces of paper money coined under this act shall be uniform in size, and the engraving on the plates on which they shall be printed or coined shall be 6 inches and seven-eighths of an inch in length and 3 inches in width.

SEC. 14. That there shall be coined out of paper an amount of money of the various denominations herein provided for sufficient to cover the total amount of the following obligations of the United States, namely, bonds, principal and interest, United States notes, old demand notes, fractional currency, gold certificates, silver certificates, certificates of deposit, Treasury notes of 1890, and the national bank notes. Whenever any of said obligations, except the bonds of the United States, come into possession of the United States, the same shall be retained, canceled, and destroyed, and in place thereof shall be substituted an equal amount of coined paper money, dollar for dollar, and the same shall thereafter be paid out upon the various obligations of the United States as they mature.

SEC. 15. That whenever any of the bonds of the United States shall be presented for payment at the Treasury thereof before the same shall become due, the Treasurer of the United States shall pay to the owner thereof the nominal or face value of the bonds presented, and interest thereon to the date of presentation, in coined paper money, dollar for dollar; but if when presented for payment as aforesaid, gold or silver coin be demanded, the Treasurer may pay the same either in gold or silver coin, or both, as he may elect. All bonds paid by the United States as herein provided for shall be immediately canceled and destroyed.

SEC. 16. That each national bank organized under the laws of the United States shall, within ninety days from and after the passage of this act, forward to the Treasurer of the United States an amount of money equal to the amount of notes issued and put into circulation by it; on receipt of which the bonds held by the United States as security for its circulation shall be delivered to it.

SEC. 17. That if any person, after the passage of this act, shall bring gold or silver bullion to the mints of the United States to be coined into money, there shall be delivered to him, at his option, the coins coined out of his bullion, or an equal amount of coined paper money, dollar for dollar; and there shall be coined and kept on hand a sufficient amount of coined paper money to meet any demand that may be made upon the Treasurer for coined paper money in exchange for gold or silver bullion.

SEC. 18. That whenever gold or silver bullion shall be exchanged for coined paper money the bullion so exchanged shall be and become the property of the United States and shall be immediately coined into money and used in the payment of the debts and obligations of the United States as they mature.

SEC. 19. That the Treasurer of the United States shall under no circumstances exchange one kind of money for another kind with any person, persons, or corporation.

SEC. 20. That in coining money out of paper, as provided for in this act, the following rule shall be observed, namely: For every twenty-dollar or unit piece there shall be coined 2 ten-dollar or unit pieces, 4 five-dollar or unit pieces, 10 two-dollar or unit pieces, and 20 one-dollar or unit pieces; for every ten-dollar or unit piece there shall be coined 2 five-dollar or unit pieces, 5 two-dollar or unit pieces, and 10 one-dollar or unit pieces; for every five-dollar or unit piece there shall be coined 5 one-dollar or unit pieces.

SEC. 21. That any of the money that may be coined out of paper under this act that shall become mutilated or injured so as to become unfit for use shall, when presented to the Treasurer of the United States by the owner thereof, or when the same shall come into the Treasury of the United States, be taken up and destroyed, and in lieu thereof shall be issued new money coined out of paper.

SEC. 22. That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 23. That the title of the act shall be amended to read as follows: "An act to establish a unit of account and to provide for the coinage of money, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute reported by the Committee on Finance as it has been amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is in the Senate and still open to amendment.

Mr. NELSON. I desire to offer an amendment as an additional section, to come in as section 10.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to the bill as a new section the following:

SEC. 10. That section 5138 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 5138. No association shall be organized with a less capital than \$100,000, except that banks with a capital of not less than \$50,000 may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be organized in any place the population of which does not exceed 6,000 inhabitants, and except that banks with a capital of not less than \$25,000 may, with the sanction of the Secretary of the Treasury, be organized in any place the population of which does not exceed 4,000 inhabitants. No association shall be organized in a city the population of which exceeds 50,000 persons with a capital of less than \$200,000."

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have no desire to submit any remarks upon the amendment, except simply to state the proposed change in the existing law. The only change is that under the amendment national banks with \$25,000 capital will be permitted to be organized in places having a population of 4,000 or less. It is to meet an urgent want in the West that the amendment has been offered.

Mr. ALDRICH. I shall not object to that amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas and Mr. TELLER called for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER (when Mr. ALLEN's name was called). I wish to announce again, on the final passage of the bill, that on this bill and all amendments which have heretofore been voted upon, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. If the Senator from Nebraska were present, he would vote "nay" on this question and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

Mr. CLAY (when Mr. BACON's name was called). If my colleague [Mr. BACON] were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. BUTLER (when his name was called). While I have had a general pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLINGTON] on this bill and on all votes which have been taken heretofore, that pair has been transferred to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW], who, if present, would vote "nay." I vote "nay."

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. KENNEY (when Mr. TURNER's name was called). The Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER] is detained from the Senate by reason of sickness. If he were present, he would vote "nay." He has a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN].

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). As announced by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. KENNEY], I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER]. If that Senator were present, he would vote "nay," and I should vote "yea."

Mr. WETMORE (when his name was called). I again announce that I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON]; but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER], and vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 46, nays 29; as follows:

YEAS—46.

Aldrich,	Fairbanks,	Lodge,	Quarles,
Allison,	Forker,	McBride,	Ross,
Beveridge,	Foster,	McComas,	Scott,
Burrows,	Frye,	McCumber,	Sewell,
Caffery,	Gear,	McMillan,	Shoup,
Carter,	Hale,	Mason,	Simon,
Clark, Wyo.	Hanna,	Nelson,	Spooner,
Cullom,	Hansbrough,	Penrose,	Thurston,
Davis,	Hawley,	Perkins,	Wetmore,
Deboe,	Hoar,	Platt, Conn.	Wolcott,
Depew,	Kean,	Platt, N. Y.	
Elkins,	Lindsay,	Pritchard,	

NAYS—29.

Bate,	Culberson,	McLaurin,	Taliaferro,
Berry,	Daniel,	Martin,	Teller,
Butler,	Harris,	Money,	Tillman,
Chandler,	Hettfield,	Morgan,	Turley,
Chilton,	Jones, Ark.	Pettus,	Vest.
Clark, Mont.	Jones, Nev.	Rawlins,	
Clay,	Kenney,	Stewart,	
Cockrell,	McEnery,	Sullivan,	

NOT VOTING—11.

Allen,	Gallinger,	Pettigrew,	Warren,
Bacon,	Kyle,	Proctor,	Wellington.
Baker,	Mallory,	Turner,	

So the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to affirm the existing standard of value, to maintain the parity in value of all forms of money, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes."

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the bill may be printed in the RECORD as it has been amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order will be made.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wish to inquire of the Senator from Rhode Island whether the bill is not also to be printed in separate form as it passed?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; I ask also that the bill may be printed separately.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That order will be made, in the absence of objection.

The bill as passed by the Senate as a substitute for House bill No. 1 is as follows:

That the dollar consisting of 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine shall, as established by section 3511 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, continue to be the standard unit of value, and all forms of money issued or coined by the United States shall be maintained at a parity of value with this standard; and United States notes, and Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, when presented to the Treasury for redemption shall be redeemed in gold coin of such standard.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury, in order to secure the prompt and certain redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes as hereinbefore provided, to set apart in the Treasury a reserve fund of \$150,000,000 in gold coin, which fund shall be used for such redemption purposes only, and whenever and as often as any of said notes shall be redeemed from said fund it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to use said notes so redeemed to restore and maintain such reserve fund in the manner following, to wit: First, by exchanging the notes so redeemed for any gold coin in the general fund of the Treasury; second, by accepting deposits of gold coin at the Treasury or at any subtreasury in exchange for the United States notes so redeemed; third, by procuring gold coin by the use of said notes, in accordance with the provisions of section 3700 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

If the Secretary of the Treasury is unable to restore and maintain the gold coin in the reserve fund by the foregoing methods, and the amount of such gold coin in said fund shall at any time fall below \$100,000,000, then it shall be his duty to restore the same to the maximum sum of \$150,000,000 by borrowing money on the credit of the United States, and for the debt thus incurred to issue and sell coupon or registered bonds of the United States in such form as he may prescribe, in denominations of \$50 or any multiple thereof, bearing interest at the rate of not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, payable quarterly, such bonds to be payable at the pleasure of the United States after one year from the date of their issue, and to be payable, principal and interest, in gold coin of the present standard value, and to be exempt from the payment of all taxes or duties of the United States, as well as from taxation in any form by or under State, municipal, or local authority, and the gold coin received from the sale of said bonds shall first be covered into the general fund of the Treasury and then exchanged, in the manner hereinbefore provided, for an equal amount of the notes redeemed and held for exchange, and the United States notes exchanged in accordance with the provisions of this section shall, when covered into the Treasury, be reissued as now provided for by law, and the gold coin in the reserve fund, together with the redeemed notes held for use as provided in this section, shall at no time exceed the maximum sum of \$150,000,000.

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury as fast as standard silver dollars are coined under the provisions of the acts of July 14, 1890, and June 13, 1898, from bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, to retire and cancel an equal amount of Treasury notes whenever received into the Treasury, either by exchange in accordance with the provisions of this act or in the ordinary course of business, and upon the cancellation of Treasury notes silver certificates shall be issued against the silver dollars so coined.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to receive deposits of gold coin with the Treasurer or any assistant treasurer of the United States in sums of not less than \$20, and to issue gold certificates therefor in denominations of not less than \$20, and the coin so deposited shall be retained in the Treasury and held for the payment of such certificates on demand and used for no other purpose. Such certificates shall be receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues, and when so received may be reissued, and when held by any national banking association may be counted as a part of its lawful reserve: *Provided*, That whenever and so long as the gold coin held in the reserve fund in the Treasury for the redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes shall fall and remain below \$100,000,000 the authority to issue certificates as herein provided shall be suspended: *And provided further*, That of the amount of such outstanding certificates one-fourth at least shall be in denominations of \$50 or less: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, issue such certificates in denominations of \$10,000, payable to order. And section 5193 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. That from and after the passage of this act no United States notes or Treasury notes shall be issued or reissued of denominations less than \$10, and all such outstanding notes of a lower denomination shall, whenever received at the Treasury or redeemed, be canceled and notes of denominations of \$10 or upward shall be substituted therefor. No silver certificates shall be hereafter issued of a higher denomination than \$10, and all such outstanding certificates of a higher denomination shall, whenever received at the Treasury or redeemed, be retired and canceled and notes of denominations of \$10 or less shall be substituted therefor.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to receive at the Treasury any of the outstanding bonds of the United States bearing interest at 5 per cent per annum, payable February 1, 1904, and any bonds of the United States bearing interest at 4 per cent per annum, payable July 1, 1907, and any bonds of the United States, bearing interest at 3 per cent per annum, payable August 1, 1908, and to issue in exchange therefor an equal amount of coupon or registered bonds of the United States in such form as he may prescribe, in denominations of \$50 or any multiple thereof, bearing interest at the rate of 2 per cent per annum, payable quarterly, such bonds to be payable at the pleasure of the United States after thirty years from the date of their issue, and said bonds to be payable, principal and interest, in gold coin of the present standard value, and to be exempt from the payment of all taxes or duties of the United States, as well as from taxation in any form by or under State, municipal, or local authority: *Provided*, That such outstanding bonds may be received in exchange at a valuation not greater than their present worth to yield an income of 2½ per cent per annum; and in consideration of the reduction of interest effected, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay to the holders of the outstanding bonds surrendered for exchange, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum not greater than the difference between their present worth, computed as aforesaid, and their par value, and the payments to be made hereunder shall be held to be payments on account of the sinking fund created by section 3604 of the Revised Statutes: *And provided further*, That the 2 per cent bonds to be issued under the provisions of this act shall be issued at not less than par, and they shall be numbered consecutively in the order of their issue, and when payment is made the last numbers issued shall be first paid, and this order shall be followed until all the bonds are paid, and whenever any of the outstanding bonds are called for payment interest thereon shall cease three months after such call.

SEC. 7. That upon the deposit with the Treasurer of the United States, by any national banking association, of any bonds of the United States in the manner provided by existing law, such association shall be entitled to receive from the Comptroller of the Currency circulating notes in blank, registered and countersigned as provided by law, equal in amount to the par value of the bonds so deposited; and any national banking association now

having bonds on deposit for the security of circulating notes, and upon which an amount of circulating notes has been issued less than the par value of the bonds, shall be entitled, upon due application to the Comptroller of the Currency, to receive additional circulating notes in blank to an amount which will increase the circulating notes held by such association to the par value of the bonds deposited, such additional notes to be held and treated in the same way as circulating notes of national banking associations heretofore issued, and subject to all the provisions of existing law affecting such notes: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to modify or repeal the provisions of sections 5167 and 5171 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, authorizing the Comptroller of the Currency to require additional deposits of bonds or of lawful money in case the market value of the bonds held to secure the circulating notes shall fall below the par value of the circulating notes outstanding for which such bonds may be deposited as security: *And provided further*, That the circulating notes furnished to national banking associations under the provisions of this act shall be of the denominations prescribed by law, except that no national banking association shall, after the passage of this act, be entitled to receive or to issue or re-issue or place in circulation any circulating notes of a less denomination than \$10: *And provided further*, That at no time shall the total amount of such notes issued to any such association exceed the amount at such time of its capital stock actually paid in. And all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this section are hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. That every national banking association having on deposit, as provided by law, bonds of the United States bearing interest at the rate of 2 per cent per annum to secure its circulating notes, shall pay to the Treasurer of the United States in the months of January and July a tax of one-fourth of 1 per cent each half year upon the average amount of such of its circulating notes as are based upon the deposit of said 2 per cent bonds, and such taxes shall be in lieu of existing taxes on its circulating notes imposed by section 5214 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 9. That the provisions of this act are not intended to place any obstacles in the way of the accomplishment of international bimetalism, provided the same be secured by concurrent action of the leading commercial nations of the world and at a ratio which shall insure permanence of relative value between gold and silver.

SEC. 10. That section 5138 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 5138. No association shall be organized with a less capital than \$100,000, except that banks with a capital of not less than \$50,000 may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be organized in any place the population of which does not exceed 6,000 inhabitants, and except that banks with a capital of not less than \$25,000 may, with the sanction of the Secretary of the Treasury, be organized in any place the population of which does not exceed 4,000 inhabitants. No association shall be organized in a city the population of which exceeds 50,000 persons with a capital of less than \$500,000."

TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 222) to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Several SENATORS. Oh, no.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I withdraw the motion for the present.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. CULLOM. My motion is pending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 222) to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. CHANDLER. Pending which motion, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. THURSTON. Will the Senator yield to me for morning business?

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will withdraw his motion until the Hawaiian bill can be placed before the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, it seems to me it is not worth while at this late hour, after a somewhat tedious day, to undertake to determine now what business the Senate will proceed to take up to-morrow.

Mr. CULLOM. There is a full Senate present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that the vote may now be taken on the question of proceeding to the consideration of the Hawaiian bill, the title of which has been read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill named by him.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 222) to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. PETTUS. If it be in order, I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like, if I may be permitted, to say to the Senator from Alabama that there are a large number of

post-office nominations, as to which requests have been made by many Senators that they be reported to-day.

Mr. PETTUS. I withdraw my motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 16, 1900, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 15, 1900.

COMMISSIONER TO INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION.

James Allison, of Kansas, to be a commissioner of the United States to the International Exposition to be held at Paris in the year 1900, to fill an original vacancy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Corps of Engineers.

Maj. William S. Stanton, Corps of Engineers, to be lieutenant-colonel, February 7, 1900, vice Benyaund, deceased.

Capt. George W. Goethals, Corps of Engineers, to be major, February 7, 1900, vice Stanton, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles Keller, Corps of Engineers, to be captain, February 7, 1900, vice Goethals, promoted.

Second Lieut. Frank C. Boggs, jr., Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant, February 7, 1900, vice Keller, promoted.

Subsistence Department.

Capt. David L. Brainard, commissary of subsistence, to be commissary of subsistence with the rank of major, February 12, 1900, vice Smith, retired from active service.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

Battalion Sergt. Maj. John M. Craig, Thirty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers, February 12, 1900, vice Toncray, promoted.

First Sergt. Israel F. Costello, Company K, Thirty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers, February 12, 1900, vice Davis, killed in action.

Sergt. John A. Huntsman, Company E, Thirty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers, February 12, 1900, vice Bowman, promoted.

Q. M. Sergt. George F. Young, Thirty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers, February 12, 1900, vice Wing, deceased.

Sergt. Maj. George J. Oden, Thirty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers, February 12, 1900, vice McGowan, promoted.

PROMOTIONS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

TWENTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY.

Lieut. Col. Albert S. Cummins, Twenty-seventh Infantry, to be colonel, February 4, 1900, vice Bell, appointed brigadier-general, United States Volunteers.

Maj. George L. Byram, Twenty-seventh Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel, February 4, 1900, vice Cummins, promoted.

Capt. Louis C. Scherer, Twenty-seventh Infantry, to be major, February 4, 1900, vice Byram, promoted.

First Lieut. Zan F. Collett, Twenty-seventh Infantry, to be captain, February 4, 1900, vice Scherer, promoted.

Second Lieut. Richard H. Brewer, Twenty-seventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant, February 4, 1900, vice Collett, promoted.

THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. Edward McGowan, Thirty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be first lieutenant, February 7, 1900, vice Toncray, deceased.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 15, 1900.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

John M. Lenihan, of Iowa, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Dubuque, in the State of Iowa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 15, 1900.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 7739. An act to amend an act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1899.

H. R. 5288. An act relating to lights on steam pilot vessels.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. SMALL, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence for ten days, on account of important business.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MONONGAHELA RIVER.

Mr. DALZELL. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill No. 4006.

The bill (H. R. 4006) authorizing the Union Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River was read, with the amendments reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. McRAE. I would like to know whether the bill has the approval of the War Department.

Mr. DALZELL. The bill is in the ordinary form of such bills; it has been approved by the Secretary of War and unanimously reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

The amendments reported by the committee were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DALZELL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ANNUAL CLERK TO THE COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS.

Mr. BULL. I am directed by the Committee on Accounts to present a privileged report. I report back favorably the resolution which I send to the desk.

The following resolution (introduced by Mr. LOUDENSLAGER on the 5th instant) was read:

Resolved, That a clerk to the Committee on Pensions is hereby authorized, at an annual salary of \$2,000, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until such salary is provided for in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BULL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT CLERKS TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. BULL. I am also directed to present another privileged report. I ask that the report be read.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is advised that there are several resolutions, for which the committee report a substitute. Does the gentleman wish to have the substitute read?

Mr. BULL. The report covers the whole ground. It is very brief. I ask that it be read.

The Clerk read the report, as follows:

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred House resolutions numbered 60, 63, 93, and 119, for the appointment of assistant clerks to the Committees on Public Lands, Claims, District of Columbia, and Rivers and Harbors, have considered the same, and beg leave to report as follows:

Your committee appointed a subcommittee to consider these and other propositions calling for additional clerical assistance to certain committees. They investigated carefully the work of the various committees, aided by oral and written evidence, and recommended to the full committee the allowance of assistant clerks to the committees above named, and an assistant clerk to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, at a salary of \$100 per month each, during the sessions of the present Congress, in which recommendation your committee concurred.

The Committee on Claims was granted an assistant clerk in the last and many previous Congresses. That committee has jurisdiction of all civil and miscellaneous claims, and its work, which is voluminous, justifies the granting of the additional clerical help requested. The Committees on Public Lands, District of Columbia, Rivers and Harbors, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries have never had assistant clerks, but we think the work of those committees warrants the allowance at this time, and we therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution in lieu of resolutions numbered 60, 63, 93, and 119, namely:

Resolved, That an assistant clerk is hereby allowed to each of the following-named committees during the sessions of the Fifty-sixth Congress, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House at the rate of \$100 per month, to wit: Public Lands, Claims, District of Columbia, Rivers and Harbors, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask whether the original resolutions have been returned?

Mr. BULL. Yes, sir.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If I caught correctly the reading of the report, this is a privileged resolution. I understand that the salaries of these clerks are to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House. Is that correct?

Mr. BULL. Yes, sir.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that fact makes the resolution privileged, and therefore I can not object to its consideration. But I do protest against the adoption of this resolution. As I understand, it provides for the appointment of five additional assistant clerks to committees of this House—five different committees. Now, I do not understand that these committees, at least some of them, have heretofore had these clerks.

Mr. BABCOCK. Will the gentleman permit an interruption at that point?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Mr. BABCOCK. During the last Congress the Committee on the District of Columbia was honored by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] as a member of that committee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is always an honor to be associated with my friend.

Mr. BABCOCK. And we had an assistant clerk during the entire session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, and the chairman of that committee had to pay the clerk \$100 a month out of his own pocket during the entire session of that Congress.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, after what the gentleman from Wisconsin has said, I will say I did not know that the gentleman had made that contribution to the public service during the last Congress.

I know that his committee considers quite a number of bills and does a great deal of work; but, Mr. Speaker, take the Committee on Claims. This resolution gives that committee an assistant clerk. Now, that committee may have and doubtless has a number of bills referred to it. But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that nearly three months of this Congress have expired and that committee has not even asked consideration of a single, solitary bill on a Private Calendar day.

That committee and the Committee on War Claims are given Friday of each week. They have not even asked this House to consider bills from that committee. Of course, it is in the power of the majority of this House to multiply clerks. It seems they are doing it. I see the able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations there, and he is not raising his voice against this increase in the clerical force.

Mr. GRAFF rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Mr. GRAFF. I desire to state, in reply to the gentleman from Tennessee, that the Committee on Claims are ready at any time that they are permitted to do so to call up for consideration the claims which are on the Calendar.

In addition to that, I will say that that committee have been holding two meetings a week, commencing at 9 o'clock in the morning, and have been devoting themselves energetically to the performance of their duty, and they have attempted to give these claims actual consideration, and we desire to have them considered in the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have made no criticism of the committee, as to what they are doing.

Mr. GRAFF. And I desire to say further to the gentleman from Tennessee, that I have been compelled to employ an additional clerk, who has been actually engaged in docketing some 700 bills which are before that committee. Every day I receive communications from the members of the House, desiring to have the different bills assigned.

In addition to the assignment of these bills to the different subcommittees and the docketing of them, proofs of the bills which are to be considered have to be supplied, and that requires a gentleman who is competent to perform the task with some intelligence. This committee has always been granted an additional clerk, at least since the Fifty-fourth Congress, since my coming to the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take issue with the gentleman further than to say that this is the first time that I have heard the chairman of that committee raise his voice in this House in behalf of claims of any kind.

The gentleman knows that, under the rules, every Friday is set apart for the consideration of bills from his committee, together with the Committee on War Claims. Friday after Friday has passed during this Congress, until nearly three months have gone, one-half of the session, and I have not heard that committee undertake to claim the Friday that is given them under the rules for the consideration of their measures.

Mr. OLMSTED rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am about through. I am not here to

take care of the majority, if they are determined to increase the clerical force of the House.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. RICHARDSON. If they are willing to add these extra officers, they have the power to do so. I simply want to say, with reference to these committees that have not had assistant clerks, that we do not think they ought to be given. Committees that have had them, committees that actually need them, ought to have them, and there will be no objection to it. Now, I do not care to take any further time.

Mr. OLMSTED. I will ask the gentleman if he does not know that, instead of providing an increase, this resolution, so far as the Committee on Claims is concerned, cuts down the salary which has usually been paid to the assistant clerk of that committee from \$6 a day to \$100 a month?

Mr. RICHARDSON. That may be true as to that committee; but then the gentleman must notice that the resolution gives additional clerks to other committees that have never had assistant clerks before.

Mr. OLMSTED. And in every instance the chairman of that committee has come before the Committee on Accounts and stated that owing to the increased business of his committee, he was obliged to pay for additional assistance out of his own pocket.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. BULL] yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. BULL. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, representing the minority upon the Committee on Accounts, I desire to say that I would not have agreed to the favorable report of this resolution if I did not believe it was a proper one.

Mr. Speaker, a great many propositions have been submitted to and considered by the Committee on Accounts, and we have carefully investigated them. The Committee on Accounts are simply desirous to give to the various committees of the House having charge of the business of the House, and to the chairmen of those committees, that assistance and aid in the way of clerical help that they absolutely need. We must remember, Mr. Speaker, that all of us have private secretaries to do our own work as members, except those who are chairmen of committees having annual or session clerks.

So it happens that all of the committees for which assistant clerks are provided in this resolution, and in the resolutions passed by the House on the other day, are committees that have a great deal of work to do, and the chairmen under the law not having any secretaries to do their work as individual members, have been compelled to pay out of their own pockets for the services of the secretaries, stenographers, or clerks to do their private work.

Now, much as I am in favor of economy in the expenditures of the public money, much as I believe that we should not extravagantly expend the public money, I for one stand here to say that the members of this House in the discharge of their public duty, whether they be Republicans or Democrats, whether the House is Republican or Democratic, are entitled to receive and shall receive at my hands so long as I am upon that committee just consideration and necessary assistance where it is required for the transaction of the public business.

And, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I am not in favor of having a condition of affairs where the chairmen of important committees are to be mulct out of their private pockets by the payment of money to secretaries to do their work as individual members, simply because they are prominent enough and distinguished enough to be chairmen of these great committees.

We have investigated this matter very carefully. We appointed a subcommittee to investigate the question. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, stated to us that all last year and even now he has been paying money out of his own pocket to a secretary to assist him in his business as an individual Representative. Other gentlemen, chairmen of committees, have done the same thing, and this resolution gives to these chairmen additional committee clerks only when we believe it is necessary. It simply gives to the chairmen of the committees named a clerk each at a hundred dollars a month, the same as every other member of the House gets for clerk hire during the session of Congress.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Accounts are unanimous in their decision that this resolution is right, and that it does not call for an unnecessary expenditure of the public money. They believe it is an expenditure in the interest of the public business, in the effective discharge of the duty of a Representative to the House and to his constituents, and it is an effort on the part of the Committee on Accounts to put those gentlemen who are chairmen of important committees upon an equality with other members.

Mr. SIMS. I agree with what the gentleman from Georgia says, but I want to ask him this question: Is there any use in providing facilities for a committee to report bills, if those bills are never to be considered in the House?

Mr. BARTLETT. I will answer the question of my friend. Now, Mr. Speaker, because there happens to be one committee upon this list that has not been able to secure a day for the consideration of its business in the House, I do not think it just that the chairman of that committee and other committees should be denied the clerical aid to which he is entitled. Speaking simply from information which I have obtained from the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF], I believe that the assistant clerk which is provided for in this resolution should be allowed. It is true that committee have not been able to secure a day in this House, because a majority of the members of the House have voted to adjourn on Friday, or have voted to take up other business, but that is no reason why an injustice should be done to the chairman of that committee.

The committee have gone on with this work; they have undertaken the discharge of the duty; they are doing it; and the chairman appeared before the committee and said that he had paid out of his own pocket money in order to discharge his duty as chairman of that committee, and therefore asked that he be given this additional clerk.

Mr. SIMS. If the work is worth nothing to the country, why do it? Why have a committee at all, if you are not going to insist upon the rights of the committee before this House?

Mr. BARTLETT. Why, Mr. Speaker, if we are to measure the work of a committee by what we think it is worth to the country, we will in many instances not allow them any clerks. I believe in a great many instances a great many bills are reported to this House which are injurious to the country. Some of the largest committees report bills which I think will do harm to the country; but for that reason I can not deny to the committee, as a member of the Committee on Accounts, the money to do the necessary clerical work of that committee or to furnish them the necessary clerical hire, especially when they have stated to us and demonstrated to us it is absolutely necessary to enable them, with fairness and with equality and with justice to themselves and with justice to this House, to discharge their duties. As a member I am ready to vote for this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the committee.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. BULL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER. How much time?

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman permit me to yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. OTEY]?

Mr. BULL. Yes, sir; I will.

Mr. OTEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak for one committee of which I have the honor to be a member, and that is the Committee on Claims. As all of you may perhaps know, that is a committee that has a great deal of work to do. We have over 700 bills now before that committee. We have been meeting at 9 o'clock in the morning on Tuesday and 9 o'clock on Thursday and a subcommittee meeting on Monday at 9 o'clock, of which I am a member, and we need all the work and assistance that a clerk can give us. We are endeavoring to bring the claims to a conclusion and get them out of the way, either by having them adversely reported or favorably reported and disposed of, and without an assistant clerk to that committee it can not be done.

Mr. SIMS. Do you know why the chairman of the committee does not demand his rights here every Friday?

Mr. OTEY. I suppose the chairman has demanded his rights. I do not know of any reason why he should not do so. He desires to get rid of these bills as well for the House as the patrons of the bills, and we are doing all we can to accomplish it; and the little question of whether we shall have assistance to carry on this work is a mere bagatelle. We had better have two assistants and have the work done. From one session to another these bills are favorably reported or not reported, and they go on for twenty or twenty-five years. Some of these bills have been before the House for twenty-five years; and it is the duty of Congress to get rid of them, and not let them stand on the calendars ad infinitum.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee, I desire briefly to define my own position in regard to the resolution before the House. It has become the custom of gentlemen when they address the House to say that such and such a report is the unanimous report of the committee. In many instances, I suppose, that is of the members who were present. Gentlemen must know that I never favored a resolution of this character. I was not present when it was adopted, and I do not desire to betray any of the confidences of the committee; but I would like the attention of the House for a moment in order that they may understand what the committee has had to contend with. This question has been before the Committee on Accounts for something like six or eight weeks.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. We can not hear what the gentleman is saying.

The SPEAKER. All gentlemen will be seated.

Mr. LOUD. This question, as I was saying, has been before the Committee on Accounts for six or eight weeks; in fact, ever since Congress has met. We have adopted resolution after resolution. I think I betray no confidence of the committee in stating that, because it is a fact, some time ago the committee adopted a resolution to give all committees that had an annual clerk an additional clerk at \$100 a month.

Now, I stated at that time, and I may as well do the same here, that, so far as the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads is concerned, which is one of those committees, I do not need and do not ask for any clerk. I would even be willing and would urge that every committee of this House having an annual clerk have a clerk to the chairman of the committee. The committee hardly thought that was fair, and they included them all. The resolution came back and was reconsidered, and reconsidered, and reconsidered. We have since then been acting on this matter piecemeal. There are chairmen of committees in this House who are too modest to come here and ask for assistance, and the result is favoritism.

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. LOUD. I will.

Mr. SHERMAN. Why can not the whole difficulty be remedied by bringing in here a resolution providing that the same clerk hire shall be allowed to all gentlemen who are members of committees during the session of Congress that is now allowed to them who are not chairmen?

Mr. LOUD. The difficulty about that is this: The committee determined on that course at one time, and we reconsidered that action and then came back and took the matter up by piecemeal and gave the Military Committee, the Naval Committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Judiciary Committee, and, I think, perhaps some others who were particularly urgent, clerks at \$6 a day. They have taken so many out of the list for important committees of this House and given them clerks at \$6 a day that it has complicated the matter, and unless you repeal the action you have taken the time has gone by for any reconsideration—

Mr. SHERMAN. Could you not except those instances?

Mr. LOUD. It is not an act of justice, permit me to say. From my experience in this House, extending over a few years, and association on several committees, I do not believe there is a committee in this House having a competent man as its clerk but what can get along with one clerk. The trouble is, Mr. Speaker, that incompetent men are appointed as clerks of committees. Now, there is a proposition contained in this resolution for a stenographer for the Committee on Invalid Pensions, because they have not got a stenographer. In the year 1900, a committee in the House of Representatives having two or three clerks and have not got a stenographer! Why, stenographers are the cheapest article in the market to-day. You can get stenographers at \$50 and \$60 a month. Let it be known that you want one and you will have 500 here in an hour.

Now, because the chairmen of committees propose to appoint John Smith or Thomas Jones as clerks of committee, incompetent to perform the work, they come to Congress and seek relief. Here is the Committee on Claims, and let us see what injustice is being done. While I believe this is doing well enough for the Committee on Claims, let me say that after having served on that committee four years, there is not a committee in this House, excepting none, that has the same work to do that this Committee on Claims has, and yet you give to the other committees assistant clerks at \$6 a day and break through the custom which has existed here for years. And you say to the chairman of the Committee on Claims, "You can have a clerk at \$100 a month," and because some one else is more persistent he shall have a clerk at \$6 a day. As a rule the clerk of chairman receiving \$100 a month during the recess is turned over to a six-dollar-a-day clerkship during the session of the House. This question is going to aggravate you until you settle it. We have got to the point now where you have given clerks to all standing committees having annual clerks, except three, four, or five, and you may just as well take this matter up now and dispose of it as to come in here by piecemeal and give clerks at \$6 a day.

Mr. BULL. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED].

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, we all know the reputation of my distinguished friend from California [Mr. LOUD] for economy, but it seems to me that, in the language of a popular minstrel song of the day, "he hasn't got his habits on" this morning. He opposes this resolution which proposes a session clerk for the 5 committees named at \$100 a month, and he opposes it because we do not give clerks to the chairmen of 21 committees instead of 5. Indeed, my distinguished friend advocated giving to the chairman of each committee having annual or session clerks \$100 per month for his own clerk hire during the sessions of the House. Now, there are 21 committees having annual clerks by law, and

17 committees having session clerks by law, so that my friend favored appointing 38 additional clerks at one fell swoop, and now opposes the granting of 5.

Mr. LOUD. The gentleman is neither truthful nor fair.

Mr. OLMSTED. I appreciate the extreme politeness of the gentleman's remark, coming from an old and distinguished member of the House. I would not have referred to what occurred in the committee if the gentleman had not already done so. I say upon my word that he did vote in favor of a resolution giving the chairman of each committee which had an annual or session clerk additional clerk hire at \$100 per month during the session, making \$8 in all—

Mr. LOUD. That is not true.

Mr. OLMSTED. When upon my motion that resolution had been reconsidered and defeated, the gentleman from California made the motion—

Mr. LOUD. I made a motion that the committees having annual clerks should have assistant clerks, but that applied only to 21 committees.

Mr. BARTLETT. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. This discussion is out of order. Gentlemen will proceed without disclosing the work of the committee.

Mr. OLMSTED. Let us see how unfair this would be. The Committee on Elections No. 1 has a \$2,000 annual clerk. It would give that chairman an additional clerk at \$100 a month during the session. How would that work as between Elections Committee No. 1 and the Committees 2 and 3, which have no annual clerk at all? The Committee on Elections No. 1 would have practically \$3,200 a year for clerk hire, while the Committees Nos. 2 and 3 would have nothing. We thought—and I am proud that I was largely responsible for the defeat of the other measure—we thought it wise to take up each committee and judge of it upon its merits; so we have recommended that these 5 committees—not the whole 21 committees—be allowed each an additional clerk, at the rate not of \$6 a day, but of \$100 a month.

Now, the chairman of each of these committees has, under the law, while Congress is not in session, an allowance of \$100 per month for clerk hire. They receive this allowance while Congress is not in session the same as members who are not chairmen of committees; so that if this resolution be adopted, each of these chairmen of these 5 committees will have, during the session of Congress, his regular allowance of \$100 a month for clerk hire besides the assistance of a \$2,000 clerk allowed to the committee. We thought that the \$2,000 clerk now allowed by law ought to be able to do the work of the committee and that the chairman as a member of the House could get along with his allowance of \$1,200 a year the same as other members. So, in the interest of economy—in the interest of the taxpayers—we recommended the adoption of the resolution reported in place of a more sweeping one granting a larger number of clerks.

The question being taken, the resolution reported by the committee was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BULL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the original resolutions for which the resolution just adopted was reported as a substitute will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

STENOGRAPHER FOR COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS.

Mr. BULL. I have one more report to make. I have been directed to report back favorably the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions be authorized to appoint a stenographer for said committee, whose salary shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House and shall not exceed \$100 per month.

Mr. SULLOWAY. I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island yield to allow the amendment to be offered?

Mr. BULL. Yes, sir.

The amendment sent to the desk by Mr. SULLOWAY was read, as follows:

Amend by striking out the words "\$100 a month" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "at \$6 per day."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to this amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I desire to say—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON]?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I desire only a minute.

Mr. BULL. I desire first to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire, if he desires to be heard in support of his amendment.

Mr. SULLOWAY. I desire to say in behalf of this amendment that the resolution now pending was introduced, I think, nearly five weeks ago. At that time the committee were hopeful that

they could secure a competent stenographer for \$100 a month; but, developing under the Darwinian process, we have found, during these four or five weeks, that it will be absolutely impossible to secure for this amount of money a man competent for this business—familiar with the medical dictionary. In asking for a stenographer at \$6 a day we are not asking any expenditure in behalf of this committee beyond what has heretofore been allowed. In the Fifty-second Congress there were two assistant clerks at \$6 per day; we have but one. In the Fifty-third Congress there were two assistant clerks at \$6 per day; we have but one. In the Fifty-fourth Congress there were three assistant clerks at \$6 a day; we have but one. If \$6 a day be allowed us to enable us to obtain a competent stenographer, we shall have a clerk and what might be termed two assistant clerks; and if you gentlemen who have bills pending in our committee, where there are 3,000 to-day, a thousand of which it has been impossible for the clerk, up to this time, to docket—if you want your bills considered and reported, then we must have this stenographer. That is all I have to say.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to rise in opposition to any of these recommendations of the Committee on Accounts. But I now rise for the purpose of emphasizing the fact that this committee is now asking something that no other committee has ever asked for or had.

Mr. SULLOWAY. The gentleman will allow me to correct him. We have had stenographers, and we have had additional assistant clerks.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understand you have now a clerk and an assistant clerk.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. RICHARDSON. And you have a special man deputized from the Pension Office—

Mr. SULLOWAY. Which this committee has always had.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Thus there are now three clerks for that committee. Now, I say that when the Committee on Invalid Pensions come to this House and ask in addition a stenographer they are asking what the House has never authorized before.

Mr. SULLOWAY. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would not undertake to put my recollection against that of the gentleman on a matter of this kind; but I have no recollection that the Committee on Invalid Pensions has ever had a stenographer.

There is only one other point to which I wish to call attention. Gentlemen on the other side have the right to make these increases if they want to do so; they have the power. I am opposed to giving this committee a stenographer, because they already have three clerks, and I also oppose increasing the pay, as recommended by the committee, from \$100 a month to \$6 a day. I believe that \$100 a month will secure an efficient stenographer for that committee, if it is necessary to have one. Therefore I shall vote against both propositions, and most earnestly against the amendment increasing the amount of the proposed salary to \$6 a day.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Does the gentleman know of a competent stenographer familiar with medical phrases who can be employed for less than \$1,600?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I take it that the member of the committee who may be dictating to the stenographer will furnish to him such information about medical terms as he may require. Of course the member must himself have the necessary acquaintance with such terms; he can not expect to depend upon his stenographer for information of that kind.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SULLOWAY], the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SULLOWAY] yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] for a question?

Mr. SULLOWAY. Certainly.

Mr. DINSMORE. Is the clerk of the Committee on Invalid Pensions a stenographer?

Mr. SULLOWAY. No, sir; he is not.

Mr. DINSMORE. Is the assistant clerk a stenographer?

Mr. SULLOWAY. No, sir.

Mr. DINSMORE. Neither one nor the other?

Mr. SULLOWAY. Neither of them.

Mr. DINSMORE. Could not all this be obviated by having one or the other of those clerks a practical stenographer?

Mr. SULLOWAY. No, sir; it is a physical impossibility for any two men, no matter who selects them or where they come from, to do the work in that committee, and have these bills examined, docketed, and cross-docketed.

In the first place, you can not docket a bill that comes from the Senate in less than fifteen minutes. Here are 3,000 bills, and we had no clerk up to the 1st of January. When he got here there were 2,000 bills piled up in the room for him to assort, separate, docket, and get ready so that when any gentleman in the House came down there and looked for his bill he could find it and tell

him where it was. The work never was done by two men and never can be.

Mr. DINSMORE. I should like to ask the gentleman if it does not add to the efficiency of any clerk or any assistant clerk of any committee to be a stenographer?

Mr. SULLOWAY. I dare say it might.

Mr. DINSMORE. Then, may I ask, in the interest of the business of the House, not with any purpose to interfere with the affairs of the committee of which the gentleman is the able chairman, if it would not be in the interest of the business of the House to have stenographers appointed as clerk and assistant clerk instead of the people who are there.

Mr. SULLOWAY. It would not be a disadvantage, but in this particular case I do not see that it would be an advantage. The work of the clerk is different from the work of the stenographer employed in that committee room. There is a special examiner that goes through all of this evidence which is filed in these different cases and makes a condensed statement of the facts—

Mr. DINSMORE. And I believe a man is detailed from the Department to do that.

Mr. SULLOWAY. This special examiner has to go through this evidence and dictate a brief statement of it to this stenographer, and that forms a great portion of the work which a stenographer has to do.

Mr. SIMS. I desire to ask the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions a question for information only.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New Hampshire yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. SULLOWAY. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. I want to ask the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions if the business before that committee is increasing?

Mr. SULLOWAY. I think it is as large or will be as large as in any previous Congress. There is every reason in the world why it should be.

Mr. SIMS. There is no decrease?

Mr. SULLOWAY. As long as there are old soldiers to-day who are shivering with cold and gaunt with hunger and not on the pension rolls there is no reason why they should not come to our committee.

Mr. SIMS. There is no decrease as I understand it?

Mr. SULLOWAY. I hope not. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. RICHARDSON. This is to increase the compensation to \$6 a day, as I understand it.

The SPEAKER. This is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire to the report of the Committee on Accounts.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that in the opinion of the Chair the ayes have it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 112, noes 44.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

The question being taken on agreeing to the resolution as amended, the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BULL. Division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BARTLETT. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. As I understand the situation, the resolution, if passed now as amended, provides for \$6 a day instead of the recommendation of the Committee on Accounts, for \$100 a month.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct in his understanding of it.

Mr. BARTLETT. I want gentlemen to understand it.

The question being taken on agreeing to the resolution as amended, on a division there were—ayes 113, noes 45.

Mr. TALBERT. No quorum, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The point is made by the gentleman from South Carolina that there is no quorum.

Mr. SHERMAN. I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the gentleman did not make the point that there is no quorum present.

Mr. TALBERT. I meant that by implication, and I now make the point that there is no quorum present, if that will satisfy the gentleman any better.

The SPEAKER, having counted the House, announced 197 members, a quorum, present.

Accordingly, the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BULL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of the bill (H. R. 7572) extending in the district of Alaska the placer-mining laws to lands reserved from sale in sections 1

and 10 of an act of Congress approved May 14, 1898, entitled "An act extending the homestead laws and providing for right of way for railroads in the district of Alaska, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for a reprint of the bill H. R. 7572. Is there objection? There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On February 7, 1900:
H. R. 6272. An act fixing the salary of the postmaster at Washington City, D. C.; and

H. R. 947. An act to create a new division in the eastern judicial district in the State of Tennessee.

On February 8, 1900:
H. R. 5042. An act to provide for improvements in the tax departments of the District of Columbia.

On February 9, 1900:
H. R. 6237. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5491. An act to amend section 4843 of the Revised Statutes; and

H. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to use \$60,000 of the appropriations for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, for the construction of a modern military hospital at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

On February 10, 1900:
H. R. 6073. An act to amend section 4 of the act of Congress approved June 16, 1880, granting to the city of Hot Springs, Ark., certain lands as a city park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5076. An act to amend the first section of an act to change the time and places for the district and circuit courts of the northern district of Texas, approved June 11, 1896; and

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution providing for the distribution of Compiled Statutes of the District of Columbia to committees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

On February 13, 1900:
H. R. 284. An act granting permission and authority to the Orleans Levee Board to move, without cost to the United States, the existing line of levee in front of the marine-hospital property in New Orleans, La.

On February 14, 1900:
H. R. 5066. An act to amend section 4290 of the Revised Statutes, relating to log entry of collisions; and

H. R. 3718. An act for the preservation of the frigate *Constitution*.

On February 15, 1900:
H. R. 4000. An act to authorize the Southeastern Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Lumber River within the boundary lines of Robeson County, N. C.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed resolutions of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. R. 10. Joint resolution providing for the printing of 3,000 copies of House Document No. 141, relating to the preliminary examination of reservoir sites in Wyoming and Colorado; and Senate concurrent resolution 19:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed and bound 20,000 copies of the message of the President transmitting the treaty of peace with Spain and the accompanying documents, in one volume, of which 13,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 7,000 copies for the use of the Senate.

SENATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills and resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. R. 10. Joint resolution providing for the printing of 3,000 copies of House Document No. 141, relating to the preliminary examination of reservoir sites in Wyoming and Colorado—to the Committee on Printing.

Senate concurrent resolution 19:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed and bound 20,000 copies of the message of the President transmitting the treaty of peace with Spain and the accompanying documents, in one volume, of which 13,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 7,000 copies for the use of the Senate—to the Committee on Printing.

S. 68. An act granting to the State of Kansas the abandoned Fort Hays Military Reservation, in said State, for the purpose of establishing western branches of the Kansas Agricultural College

and of the Kansas State Normal School thereon, and for a public park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 41. An act to authorize the President to place Andrew Geddes on the retired list with the rank of captain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BURKE of South Dakota, for four days, on account of important business.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

And then, on motion of Mr. HEMENWAY, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8347) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes, with Mr. SHERMAN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] is recognized.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield forty-five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Massachusetts sits down, will he, as a member of the committee, answer me a question?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Georgia that I am not on the subcommittee which has in charge this particular bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. I merely want to ask the gentleman if in this bill provision is made for the payment of salaries due to members who have died during this Congress?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am informed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] who is in charge of this bill that that subject properly belongs to the deficiency bill and is not, therefore, upon this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to call the attention of the committee to the fact that an equal distribution of the time between the two sides would leave seventy-eight minutes to the Republican side and thirty-two minutes to the Democratic side, considering the time that was used on yesterday.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] yields to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL] forty-five minutes.

[Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, just a moment, if the gentleman from Alabama please. How much time would my colleague like—thirty minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has but three minutes remaining.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. There are others who want to speak, and I will not take further time. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has thirty-two minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thought I had thirty-eight minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire the gentleman from Alabama to occupy that entire time?

✓ Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to him such time as he wants.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, some time ago I introduced a resolution in favor of the repeal of the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I do not know what fate that resolution may meet with in the committee to which it is referred; nor do I know that there ever will be an opportunity in this Congress to discuss that resolution directly on the floor of this House. I therefore take advantage of this opportunity to give some reasons why I believe the time has come when it is not only right, but expedient that the people of the United States should seriously, without partisan prejudice or political strife, consider this great question of limitations or the rights of limitations of the franchise in the United States.

In his Farewell Address to the people of the United States George Washington, in speaking of our Government, said: "Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty."

In a republic the keystone in the arch of government, above all other questions, must be a love of liberty by the citizens of the Republic, and the mental capacity and desire to discriminate between "true liberty" and personal license; for if the latter is allowed to go uncontrolled it must result in the subversion of the rights and liberties of others.

To the people of the United States belong the sovereign power to make and control the fundamental principles of government, and first among these must always stand the power to regulate and control the suffrage.

We therefore must face the problem as to how we can best grant the privilege of the ballot to those who will understand and uphold liberty in its truest and highest sense, together with the other great principles of government, and at the same time allow to the citizen the fullest share of civil liberty and freedom of action that can be given without danger to the Republic.

The only true guide that we can use in determining how to solve this vexed and difficult question is that which is the best for the greatest number of people, and we must not be misled by our sympathies and prejudices for individual or particular classes. We must never forget that the duty of preserving civil liberty in this country is intrusted to the people as a sacred heritage from our Revolutionary forefathers, and the ballot is the weapon by which it must be preserved if properly exercised, for if subverted it will become the tool of base, ignorant, or unscrupulous men, by which the liberties of the people will be finally overthrown.

It has been said "that the right of suffrage is at the foundation of our Government; that it is the moving power and first principle that puts it in motion, and sustains, operates, and gives it direction in all its parts."

It is evident that when the power of the ballot is given to unfit or unscrupulous men it will in the end corrupt both the voters and the officeholders, and produce bad laws, dishonest legislation, a corrupt judiciary, and tyrannical executive officers. It will corrupt the people because it gives greater opportunity for bad men to succeed by dishonest methods, and a greater temptation and opportunity to resort to them; and it will produce corruption because honest men will abhor the means necessary to attain success and leave those men who do not scruple as to the methods to be employed in sole possession of the political field.

On the other hand, if the privilege of the ballot is only granted to those who act from patriotic motives, with honesty and intelligence, it elevates the right of the franchise, it makes it a privilege that every good citizen will guard with care, political power will emanate from a pure and uncorruptible source, dishonest men will not dare to enter into the contest for office, and the principles of liberty and good government will become perpetuated in our political institution.

Whenever an effort is made to elevate the right of franchise or to disqualify unfit persons from the right of the ballot, the demagogue and time server is sure to at once assail you with the often misapplied and misquoted maxim "that all men are born free and equal." So they are in some respects. All men are entitled to equal freedom of action and thought; all men are entitled to stand on an equality before the law, and all men are entitled to equal protection from the Government. But it can not be contended that one who is being consumed by a hereditary disease is the physical equal of the robust young man who has never known sickness, nor can one who has been ushered into this life an idiot be said to stand the intellectual equal of the great, liberal, and just statesman who wrote the Declaration of Independence. If Jefferson had believed that all men were his mental, moral, and intellectual equals, he would have returned home and freed his slaves, and insisted that the privilege and duties of government be put in their hands; but he did not do so.

As a matter of fact, nowhere are men endowed with equal political rights to-day. Some men are exempt from jury duty, working the public roads, and serving their country as soldiers. An educational qualification is required for one to practice medicine; only those learned in the law are allowed to hold judicial positions; men are excluded from the exercise of the elective franchise on account of moral qualifications, and in most of the States women, no matter what may be their intellectual qualifications, are denied the right to vote on account of their sex; and throughout all the Union men are denied the right of the ballot until they are 21 years of age, in order to secure, to a certain extent, a constituency of matured intelligence.

When the question is raised as to who should be entitled to exercise the right of suffrage, the public safety should be the governing test. It should not be sufficient to say that a man may in time, or his descendants may ultimately, acquire sufficient intelligence and moral character to authorize them to take part in the government of the State; but the question is, Do they possess now those qualifications that justly entitle them to exercise the power of government, and can they safely be intrusted with the high privilege of governing themselves and their neighbors?

I contend that no greater crime can be committed against the people—yes, against the Government itself—than to prematurely thrust the powers of government upon a people who are morally and intellectually disqualified to exercise this high privilege. It is incompatible with the public good and has a tendency to weaken and destroy the Constitution.

I do not believe that any gentleman on this floor will controvert the proposition that the public good must determine what qualifications must be placed on the right of suffrage, and that any limitation that is placed on this right for the benefit of good government is not an abridgment of the liberties of the citizen.

With these principles to guide us, let us take up the question of suffrage as it is affected by the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It reads as follows:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

In *Ex parte Yarborough* (110 U. S., page 665) the Supreme Court says:

This new constitutional right was mainly designed for citizens of African descent.

As construed by this and other decisions of the Supreme Court, the negro race is given a privilege under the Constitution that is not accorded to citizens of other nationalities. You can exclude the Mongolian, the Indian, or the white man on account of his race, but you can not exclude the black man. The Indian and the Chinese are to-day excluded from the right of suffrage in some of the States, regardless of the personal qualifications of the individual citizen. This being the case, is it just to the great body of American voters to insist that the fundamental law of the land shall grant this protection to one class of our citizens when it is not granted to other races better qualified to exercise the right of the ballot.

On the 13th day of March, 1870, when the fifteenth amendment was adopted, the country had just emerged from a bloody civil war; the South was crushed by defeat and devastated by war; the North was triumphant and flushed with the success of victory; the Southern States were about to take their place once more in the councils of the nation; and it is probable that the politicians of the North feared that if political power was placed in the hands of their late foe the contentions of war might be revived and renewed, and for this reason they desired to confer the right of suffrage on a class of people whom they believed they could control and direct.

The unwisdom of their actions, viewed in the light of the past, must be apparent to all fair-thinking men, when we know that the people of the South under no terms and conditions would return to or countenance slavery in this country or any of its dependencies; when we have seen the soldier of the South fighting in the same battle line with the soldier of the North for the honor of our common country and the glory of the flag of the nation.

You have tried the experiment for thirty years, and it has failed. Instead of its becoming a source of strength to the Republican party, it has proved to be a badge of weakness. You can not by your laws contravene the laws of God. The Almighty, in His divine wisdom, has made some frail and others strong, some races weak and others great and powerful.

Ever since the day when the Aryan (or white) race came down from the Caucasian Mountains and overran Europe, though they were barbarians, no other race of people have been able to stand against them. They acquired the civilization of those they conquered, but retained the power to rule. They embraced the Christian religion and carried the banner of the cross to Palestine at the point of their swords. They have dared the dangers of an unknown ocean and cleared the path of civilization through the trackless forests of America. They are the only race who have ever known the art of self-government and who have been able to maintain the liberty of the individual citizen. In this country, whether their ancestors landed with the Pilgrim fathers at Plymouth Rock or with the Cavaliers at Jamestown, the same blood flows through their veins. They have never bowed to the domination of an inferior race and never will; and the man who seeks to make them subservient to an inferior race is not only a traitor to his own blood, but is foreordained to failure by a law of nature that the legislation of man is powerless to change.

Nothing but reckless brutality will array the weaker race against the stronger, for in the end the weaker must give away. Instead of the helping hand he should receive from the stronger toward his intellectual and moral development, it forces a strife that can only result in the further degradation of the weaker race.

In many of the Southern States immediately after the war the negro was in absolute political control. What was the result? Government became a farce; bribery stalked in the legislative halls; justice was purchased at a price, and corruption held the reins of power; the rights of property became insecure; life was endangered every hour, and anarchy reigned, clothed in the robes of ignorance.

In my State in four years a debt of twenty millions was created; negro legislators were bought and sold at the price of a suit of clothes; and the women dared not walk the streets in broad daylight without armed protection. Men of the North, would you submit to such a condition, would you have abandoned your homes and your property, or would you have snatched the brand from the burning, the government of your State from dishonor, at whatever the cost? As long as this condition remains do you expect to see anything but the solid South? Can you expect any political question to become more dominant than the right of self-preservation?

After thirty years the great bulk of the negro population of the South is no further advanced than it was when the fifteenth amendment was passed, and yet it is not because they have not had the opportunity. In the State of Alabama they do not pay 5 per cent of the taxes, and yet they have their own schools, their own teachers, and receive an equal share of the school money in proportion to population. There is not a State in the Union where the negro has a better or fairer opportunity to work at any trade or employment he may desire under the protection of the law than in Alabama.

As a race he has not advanced morally or intellectually because he has been forced prematurely into political contests with the superior white race. I do not believe the negro race can ever become the equal of the white race, because the Creator of the universe did not so intend it, but he can develop under the protection and guidance of his white neighbor to a point where he will reach a proper understanding of the rules of government and good morals, when he will respect good government and know that liberty does not mean license.

But this can only come by removing the continued political contests that now exist and by making the right of suffrage a high privilege to be attained by him, rather than a useless right that is not valued or understood.

Some may say you can accomplish this fully by an educational qualification, but I say that you can not accomplish the result in this way in the South. I have known many young negroes in the South who could read and write as a parrot can talk who had no conception of the rights of others or the necessity of good government and probably never will have. On the other hand, I have known honest, law-abiding, property-holding white men, who have not had the benefits of an education and could not read and write, who understood the theory of our Government as well as you or I, whose votes are absolutely above any price, and who are far more capable of exercising the right of suffrage than many men who have had an education.

There can be no doubt that the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution is a mistake. It has failed in its object, and it can not advance the material and moral development of the negro race. On the contrary, it has a tendency to array one race against the other, and, as I have already stated, a conflict must inevitably result in injury to both races.

Let us then face the question fairly and honestly; let us repeal the fifteenth amendment and allow the States the untrammelled privilege of regulating the suffrage without conflict with the Federal Government. The tendency in all free governments is always toward an enlargement of the franchise, and it can be depended upon that the sovereign power of the States, vested in the people, will never deprive any man of this high privilege in whose hands it can be intrusted without endangering the Government and the true principles of liberty.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CANNON). As no one addresses the Chair—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask unanimous consent to extend the debate until 4 o'clock, thirty minutes to be used on this side and thirty minutes on the other side.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do not know of anyone who wants to use any time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend general debate until 4 o'clock.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. One-half of the time to be given to this side and one-half to the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the better way is to let the committee rise, because the House has made an order that debate shall close at 3 o'clock.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. HEPBURN, the Speaker pro tempore, resumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent that general debate be continued until 4 o'clock, one half to be under the control of the gentleman from Indiana and the other half to be controlled by this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the general debate be extended until 4 o'clock, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Indiana and the other half by the gentleman from Georgia. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for the further consideration of the appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield twenty-five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MIERS].

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the question of our new possessions is higher than a party question. It ought not to be a party question. In matters of fundamental policy, where the true doctrines of Americanism have been called up in our hearts, we have always forgotten that we had ever been partisans, and remembered only that we were patriots. Mr. Chairman, I am proud that I was a member of this House when, with magnificent unanimity, we voted for a declaration of American principles and to perpetuate those principles among the suffering people of the island of Cuba without fear of the result or hope of reward. Mr. Chairman, that was a glorious day in American history. I want to read again that resolution:

First. That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second. That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third. That the President of the United States be, and hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into active service of the United States the militia of the several States, to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise authority, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

What a magnificent spectacle, a strong nation stretching forth its arm to protect and not to subjugate the weak. It was a magnanimous people who in the name of liberty proclaimed to the world that their brothers should be free at whatever cost and without benefits of any kind to accrue in return. Our hearts were afire with a patriotic glow, and as we returned to our homes the streets were bedecked with flags and we listened to the plaudits of the multitudes. The press, without regard to politics, applauded our act. We were Americans. We had inherited from our sires the spirit of '76. We remembered the deeds of our fathers in far-off New England and in the sunny South. The words of the Declaration of Independence were to our minds as though they had been written but the day before. All men were equal under the law; all men were, and of right ought to be, free.

We poured out our treasure of blood and gold, and the Stars and Stripes carried freedom with them wherever they floated. The cause of freedom met with not a single reverse. The boys in blue performed deeds of valor and heroism which gained for the American Army the admiration of the entire civilized world. That was true Americanism. There was no Republicanism in it, there was no Populism in it, there was no Democracy in it. It was a question which shook to the very foundation the American Republic, and I do not believe that there was then a single traitor at heart to be found in all America.

The war was fought, and at its conclusion we found ourselves bound to carry out the purposes of this resolution and provide for Cuba an independent government. We found that we had also freed, in freeing the Cubans, the other colonists of Spain. The colonies of Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands were ceded to us to do as we pleased with. Americanism had commanded of us, with respect to Cuba, that we spend millions of money and thousands of valuable lives in order to give them an independent government. The war was successful beyond our dreams. In addition to being able to confer this boon of independence upon the island of Cuba, we were able also to confer it upon Puerto Rico and the Philippines. We had not only carried the flag of freedom across the narrow channel which divides Florida from the Pearl of the Antilles, but we had carried it 7,000 miles across the Pacific and claimed for liberty a part of the Orient where liberty had never before been known.

Mr. Chairman, this war was not fought as a business investment in order that we might make money. This war was not fought in order that we might subjugate other lands. This war was fought and America expended blood and gold in order to make other people independent and free, as we are independent and free. But, Mr. Chairman, instead of the flag we must not raise the standard of the dollar, and hold the dollar so close to the eyes that it hides the flag from view.

Have we heard upon the floor of this House any discussion as to what would better the conditions of the people of Puerto Rico or serve to enable them to establish their independence? Has anyone intimated that this bill will enable the Filipinos to form a stable and independent government? Not one word, Mr. Chairman. It is all reduced to a cold, mathematical calculation. We bought the islands of the Philippine Archipelago and paid \$20,000,000 for the privilege of establishing an independent government. We paid two dollars and a half a head for men who, under our Declaration of Independence and our American system, are as much entitled to independence as we are. Shall we shoot down and kill all of the men who object to being sold to the United States for two dollars and a half?

Mr. Chairman, we hear the wails of the people from Puerto Rico. They tell us what they need in order to make themselves self-supporting and happy. They tell us from what financial disease they are suffering. Shall we arise to the emergency of the occasion and give them the remedy? It is a question with the House. What is the humane thing to do? It is what is best for Puerto Rico, and not what will bring the most money into the Treasury of the United States.

We hear the opinion plainly expressed that Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines will be parceled out for the benefit of individual Americans. This must not be so. As a result of the grand war for humanity, I protest against even the expression of such an opinion. If subsequent events prove the assertion to be true, it will cause the blush of shame to mantle the cheek of every true American. I make no charges, because I still hope that patriotism, which I know is not dead in any man upon this floor, will triumph. We are still Americans, but different interests incline and warp the judgment of some. The islands are wealthy, and this fact has aroused greed and avarice. Greed and avarice should never be allowed to have a place in the dictation of national legislation.

The principle upon which the American Government is founded is stated in the Declaration of Independence in the following language:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

The Declaration proceeds to enumerate the grievances against the Crown of Great Britain. The principal ones of these are that King George kept an army in the United Colonies in times of peace and that the colonies were taxed without representation. Has there ever been a consent by the people of Puerto Rico or the people of the Philippines to a government by the United States? Are we not maintaining military authority in Puerto Rico in time of peace? Is not this very provision a taxation for the benefit of the United States of the people of Puerto Rico without in any way granting them a representation? Not a word in the entire Declaration of Independence must apply to us in our treatment of the people of Puerto Rico, Cuba, or the Philippines.

The colonies had ample cause for rebellion. Every American is proud of the fact that his forefathers did rebel and that liberty was established upon the Western Hemisphere. That spirit of the equality of men and the rights of the governed to their own self-government, the spirit of liberty, breathed through every word of the declaration of war with Spain. The war of the Revolution and the war with Spain were fought upon the fundamental American principles. And now it is advocated upon the floor of this House that we abandon the American principle in our treatment of these peoples and adopt the principle Great Britain applied to us when we were her colonists. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the gentlemen in this House will pause and deliberate before they so act. There is not one of us who, if he can cast aside all consideration of money and look at this question not from a partisan but from an American standpoint, will deny these people their liberty and will vote to give these people either admission upon terms of equality or independence in the matter of their own government.

I want to read to this House a paragraph from the Farewell Address of President George Washington:

The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so, for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquillity at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity, of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your National Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety, discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

It is a national maxim: "United we stand; divided we fall."

Mr. Chairman, President McKinley is reported to have said in a speech at Pittsburgh that Puerto Rico and the Philippines were as much ours as Louisiana or Texas. Granting this to be true as against Spain, the United States could not under the Constitution sell either Louisiana or Texas by a treaty. They could not sell Puerto Rico or the Philippines. The nations of Europe deal in islands; they buy them, they sell them, and they trade them. Under the peculiar form of government we have in the United

States this Government can not go into business as a real-estate speculator with a view to profit and loss. This Government is a chain of States, and it is only as strong as is the weakest link. For us to have a republican government on the continent, a despotic sultanish in the island of Sulu, a military government in Puerto Rico, a protectorate in Cuba, an aristocracy in Alaska, and possibly a monarchy in Hawaii is to entirely destroy the foundation of the Union, and it will be impossible for us to hold these discordant elements together.

I do not wish to be severe in my criticism of those who do not agree with me, but I warn them that this new policy will disrupt the Union and make the words of Lincoln in his first inaugural address apply nearly as strongly to-day as they did when spoken:

We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

We have been termed by the press expansionists and antiexpansionists. The terms are misnomers. No one would call it expansion to add these little bits of islands scattered thousands of miles apart, the aggregate of which would not result in as much expansion as did the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the controversy concerning what is known as "No Man's Land." That decision expanded this country more than these conquests did. There was never anything said or thought about this decision. There was more expansion in No Man's Land because there was more room for expansion. It is impossible for the United States to expand in Puerto Rico, because the island is over populated now, as are the islands of the Philippine Archipelago, and in both instances there is no room for expansion, but only room for contraction.

There are no anti-expansionists in the United States. The United States have expanded in territory, wealth, and population more rapidly than any other country in the world. The settled policy of the United States has been to add contiguous territory as rapidly as such territory can be assimilated into the Union. No one is trying to overturn this wise policy. The State of Texas alone has enough unoccupied land to supply our needs for many years to come. When all of the States of our Union have become so developed that new lands are necessary the opportunity will arise, as opportunities have arisen in the past, for us to still further extend our boundaries. We want the Stars and Stripes to float over none but freemen. We want America for Americans. We don't want Americans that can not be Americanized. We want to exert our great strength in bestowing the blessings of freedom upon the people of other lands and to encourage the cause of liberty throughout the world. We have been a world-power for good ever since the Declaration of Independence was signed, and we want to continue to be a world-power for good until the end of time. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I hope that we will deliberate upon this bill as Americans, and not as partisans. I hope we will carry out the spirit of the Declaration of Independence and of the resolutions declaring war with Spain. Let us not lessen the dignity which we now have in the eyes of the world on account of our noble war for the sake of humanity by a party squabble as to how to make the most of the spoils of the conquest. I want to deal with this question under the broad principles expounded by the Declaration of Independence and perpetuated by the stars and stripes of the American flag. I do not want to wave the dollars. I want to wave the principles. I do not care whether the Philippines were worth \$20,000,000 or nothing at all. If, with the expenditure of \$20,000,000 or any other sum, we can carry out the principles of our just and glorious war and enable struggling people to be free, I will consider it money well spent; but to try to make a profit out of the liberties of our brethren in any part of the world is beneath the character of the American people. [Applause.]

We have no internal dissensions. The flag is revered by all. The South and North stand together, guarding the sacred charge of national peace and unity. This wonderful Republic of ours, unparalleled in its onward and upward career, has expanded from 13 States, with a population of 3,000,000, to a gigantic power of 45 States, with a population of 80,000,000. Let the blood of the heroes of the Revolution, of the war of 1812, of 1861, and of the Spanish war incite in all Americans the true spirit of the founders. Let us read anew the Constitution and the famous Declaration of Independence, and not forget the patriotic devotion which led these men to the field of mortal conflict, and emulate the spirit of self-sacrifice which animated these heroes to the strife for perpetuity of the Republic. We should always bear in mind the terse and significant saying of Jefferson: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." It is a price which must be paid or liberty must be lost, substantially at first and formally at last. Liberty flourishes not like the weeds in the field, without labor or attention, but like the useful grain, which requires painstaking culture to maintain its life and perishes by neglect.

The new problems now upon us call for a wise and speedy solution. Casting away the bonds of mere partisan feeling and prejudice, let us apply ourselves to the task of working them out for the highest interests of our country. The nation's heroes died for it. Let us accept their legacy of honor and live for it. Let us not neglect our means of salvation. We have these at our command; the destiny of the nation is in our hands. The world is waiting the issue of their final decision.

We have a weapon firmer set
And better than the bayonet;
A weapon that comes down as still
As snowflakes fall upon the sod;
But executes a freeman's will,
As lightning does the will of God.

If we employ it against the powers of evil, we can make our nation the joy of all the earth; and in every latitude and clime, whether at home or in distant lands, it will be the highest boast of every man, "I am an American citizen." [Applause.]

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I now yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHOWALTER].

Mr. SHOWALTER. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this appropriation, and, believing that there is no doubt of its passage, I will, under the rule prevailing in the House, devote my time to the consideration of another subject.

Mr. Chairman, in the summer of 1898 I was invited to make an address at a presentation of the flag, by the young ladies of my town, to the public school. I said in part: "I congratulate the young ladies upon the result of their labors. They have wrought a beautiful work. I congratulate them because of the patriotic spirit that prompted them to this service. It is the same spirit as exhibited by their mothers in earlier days, a spirit of devotion and love of country, and why not? For who has sacrificed more for the dear old flag than the mothers, wives, and sisters of our land? For it they poured out their heart's richest treasures; for it in silence and alone they endured untold anguish for loved ones battling that it might float in freedom's air. For it they have suffered, for it they have trained their sons to die if necessary in its defense. All honor to the noble women of America for their devotion to the flag of their country. That flag represents the hopes and aspirations of millions of our race. It is the emblem of freedom. It represents more to-day than ever before in its history. Under its beneficent folds has recently been fought to a successful issue the most holy war ever waged—a war for humanity. Under its shining stars the immortal Dewey and his brave sailors won the greatest naval battle ever fought and placed the flag of their country and the American eagle in the far distant Orient—there, let us trust, to remain forever.

"I for one am in favor of keeping what we have conquered, and never returning to the blighting, damning rule of Spain one foot of land wrested from her by the courage, the valor, and the blood of American heroes. When we declared war we deliberately declared to the world that we did not desire any new territory, and we meant it. But a power higher, greater, than the American Congress ordained otherwise. Without intent upon our part, we have been irresistibly swept, as by an avalanche, into a position from which we can not in honor recede. We have become a world power. The God of nations has a work for us to do. Boys and girls, prepare yourselves for the great work. No greater or more golden opportunities were ever offered to the educated, intelligent young men and women than will be offered to you upon your graduation.

"With rich opportunities at home for advancement, the acquisition of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines waiting with outstretched arms for your coming to colonize, educate, Christianize, and govern, will give you advantages and opportunities undreamed of in times gone by. May you be ready and prepared for the high duties that await you; may you ever maintain as your fathers have the dignity, honor, and glory of the flag!"

I quote this part of my address upon that occasion that you may know that I am no recent convert to the doctrine of expansion. At that early day, long before the signing of the treaty with Spain, when few public men had expressed their views, when nine-tenths of the Republican press were opposed to the permanent retention of the Philippines, I was a firm believer that the God of nations had a duty for us to perform and that duty could only be performed by permanently retaining Puerto Rico and the Philippines.

What else could we do with these islands? We could not turn them back to Spain; we could not leave them, unarmed for defense and untried in statecraft, to the horrors of domestic strife or to partition among European powers. We had assumed the responsibilities of victory, and wherever our flag has gone, there the liberty, humanity, and civilization which that flag embodies and represents must remain and abide forever. The civilized nations of the world and wise and patriotic men of all parties in our own land now see that there is but one course for us to pursue, and that course is being pursued by our able and wise Chief Magistrate.

Once and for all time let it be known that we are in lawful possession of the Philippines, with a double title, that of conquest and that of treaty—a title as indisputable as that of California or Alaska. Let it be known that that generation is yet unborn that will ever see them abandoned to another power. America acquires territory; she never surrenders it. And how shall we govern the Philippines? Govern them as Jefferson governed Louisiana—under the Constitution, which grants the power to acquire territory or other property anywhere, and govern it as we please, the inhabitants having the constitutional guaranty of civil rights and such political rights as Congress may confer under that provision of the Constitution which says, "Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory belonging to the United States." This constitutional power is not longer seriously doubted by anyone save the "constitutional lawyer."

The preponderance of constitutional authorities, headed by Gouverneur Morris, Daniel Webster, and Thomas Benton, and an unbroken tendency of decisions by the courts of the United States for the last fifty years, from Chief Justice Waite and Mr. Justice Miller down to the most recent utterance on the subject, that of Justice Morrow, of the circuit court of appeals, sustains this power. We are in the Philippines as we are in the West Indies, because duty called us and we responded to the call. Shall we now prove recreant to the opportunities that are showered upon us? Never in all history has such opportunities been thrust upon any nation. Are we equal to the occasion? The two richest archipelagoes in the world are in our possession.

The largest ocean on the globe is in our hands—the ocean that is to bear the commerce of the twentieth century. The Philippines are the gateway or foothold for our trade with China. They command China, India, the Orient, the whole Pacific for the purposes of offense, defense, and trade. China's foreign commerce in 1897 was \$286,000,000, in round numbers, of which we had less than 9 per cent. In ten years we will have 50 per cent. China only has 350 miles of railroad for her 400,000,000 people—less than a mile to the million of population. In ten years she will likely have 10,000 miles. Her trade is the most powerful commercial factor in our future.

The 400,000,000 American citizens of the twentieth century demand that we retain the Philippines and the command of this great trade for them. Shall we prove recreant to the duty that posterity imposes? Shall we yield to the demand of the unpatriotic so-called anti-imperialists and surrender this rich possession with its command of this vast trade? Shall the historian record that at this unexampled crisis in our history we were timid and short-sighted and were unequal to the duty of the hour? Shall we prefer, with the teeming population that the century will bring us, to be a "hibernating nation, living off its own fat," a "hermit nation?" Not to do our duty now means the perpetual isolation of this continent. We will do our duty now, as we ever have in the past. Every pledge made by the Republican party has been redeemed.

Many stirring events have transpired since the 4th of March, 1897. Our party, led by its matchless chieftain, William McKinley, has gained new victories and won fresh laurels. It has proven itself, as it ever has from the day of its birth down to the present hour, able, patriotic, prompt, and fearless in the discharge of every duty. When it came into power the country was straggling for existence, handicapped, burdened, and oppressed by the operations of the obnoxious tariff law of the last Administration. Under the malign influence of that law, our mills and factories and forges were closed, 2,000,000 American workingmen were thrown out of employment and idle; every industry languishing, business of all kinds paralyzed, with the national debt increased in a time of absolute peace to the extent of \$262,000,000.

The Republican party came into power and was equal to the occasion. It promptly redeemed its pledge and gave to the people a new tariff law, every line of which is American, and under the benign influence of which every industry except that of the "soup house" has revived. Work for the workingman, business for the business man, good prices for the products of the farm, with more than a sufficient revenue to run the Government on a peace basis, and prosperity for all has been the result of this wise enactment. The party redeemed its pledge on the money question and maintained the national honor. The passage through the United States Senate by the Demo-Populists of the TELLER resolution, providing for the payment of our bonds in silver, was overwhelmingly defeated in the House of Representatives by a united Republican phalanx, thus maintaining and preserving our national honor. That day, January 31, 1898, was a momentous one in the history of our country.

To the minds of many the situation that confronted the American Congress on that day was of greater moment, freighted with more evil consequences and peril, than the situation that confronted the country in the dark days of the early sixties. Then it was a question whether the Government handed down to us by

our forefathers should be maintained as a single republic or whether we should have two republics in these United States. It was a question of union or disunion. On the 31st of January, 1898, it was a question of honesty or dishonesty, whether we should be honest with our own people and the people of other lands, or whether we should be dishonest with our own people or the people of other lands. It was a question of honor or dishonor. The United States Senate had passed the resolution declaring in favor of paying our just and honest obligations in 44-cent dollars. It had declared virtually for repudiation of 56 cents on every dollar of our debt. The Republicans of the House of Representatives deserve the thanks of the American people for preventing this great nation from being plunged into the vortex of national repudiation, dishonor, and disgrace.

May that policy never prevail which will sully our fair fame and make us a reproach among the nations of the earth. The Republican party established our finances on a sound and solid basis, and it intends to keep them there. The country can rest assured that as long as the Republican party is in power the national credit will be maintained, and not only will our national bonds be paid in 100-cent dollars, but also will our workingmen in factory, forge, and field and everybody else receive their pay in 100-cent dollars. The wild theories of our misguided free-silver friends find no place in our midst, and I firmly believe that when the American people again get an opportunity they will bury them under an avalanche of ballots so deep that they never again will be resurrected.

The Republicans of the House of Representatives deserve the thanks of the nation for their patriotic stand on the Cuban resolutions. From the day that our noble battle ship with her 266 brave sailors went down to death in the dark, sullen, and mysterious waters of Habana Harbor, victims of cruel, treacherous Spanish hatred, I knew, everyone who felt the public pulse knew, that nothing but armed intervention in the affairs of Cuba, to the end that the struggling patriots fighting for liberty and independence should be free, would appease the just and awful wrath of an aroused, awakened American conscience, but it was important that no false or unsound position should be taken. We were making history, we were writing legislation for the emulation of the nations of the world. To take a false or uncertain position was to create dissensions at home and annoyance and interference abroad.

How wisely the Republicans of the House of Representatives acted during the strain and excitement of many long and wearisome hours of continued session let history and a grateful people tell. We entered upon a war for humanity, the most holy war ever waged, the result of which no one ever doubted—the freedom and independence of Cuba. We entered upon this struggle to rescue and succor starving childhood and outraged womanhood, over 300,000 of whose starved and outraged bodies had enriched the soil of Cuba in the past five years. That we did right every patriotic citizen believes. We expected no recompense except the approval of our own consciences and the smiles of an approving God. That we are to be recompensed by the acquisition of valuable territory is now certain.

The proper government of these territories for the time being devolves upon the Republican party; upon its wise and patriotic leader, the President of the United States, whom to know is to honor and to love. The American people, the civilized world, are looking to us, expecting, demanding, that we restore peace and order in the Philippines, and they shall not be disappointed. Peace and order shall prevail there even though it takes our last dollar and last gun. The insurrection must be effectually crushed, so that peace, tranquillity, and freedom shall be established and maintained. Under the flag of the Republic and the honest administration of wise laws these beautiful islands are destined to become the abode of a contented, prosperous, happy people, loving and revering the Stars and Stripes, enjoying a liberty and freedom undreamed of by their wildest enthusiasts.

I deplore the attacks upon the Administration on account of its Philippine policy, because of the encouragement it gives to the Filipino insurgents, great encouragement; and hope and a determination to continue fighting has been the result of these attacks. These are well-substantiated facts, as witness the statements of the lamented, courageous Lawton, of General Wheeler, and many others in the Philippines. Every such attack coming from the Senate or House rings the death knell to an American soldier. Let us as patriots forget that we are partisan and rise above such detractions; let us support, instead of censure, until every armed insurgent lays down his arms and acknowledges the sovereignty of the United States. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield seventeen minutes and a half to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I did not think twenty-four hours ago that I would ever again address the House of Representatives on the subject of the civil-service law and its administration. I have stood in my place on this floor, a good deal of

the time almost alone, at other times with eloquent and able support, and have pointed out to the House of Representatives, and indirectly to the country, some of the fallacies and errors of civil-service literature and arguments. But we had a committee appointed at each Congress since 1883, nominally called "The Committee on Reform in the Civil Service," and had in the two branches of Congress introduced and referred to that committee and its kindred committee in the Senate bills running up in number to the thousands, bills for the repeal of the law absolutely, bills for every form of modification that genius and statesmanship could devise, and yet up to to-day there has never been in this House a report on a single one of those bills.

That which has suggested itself to my mind during all this period of time has been that that committee has always been so constituted that it hovered with patriarchal anxiety over this bantling of mistaken education, and was afraid to trust the representatives of the people with any measure upon which it might ingraft an amendment that would have expressed the views of the House of Representatives. And so we have had the door locked and the pigeonhole stuffed full of measures and no reports. The facts which have changed my own views about again speaking to the House happened here on yesterday, when the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, in charge of the pending bill [Mr. HEMENWAY], representing, as I assume he does, the views of at least a majority of that great Committee on Appropriations, had courage enough to tell the country something of what is going on under this beautiful administration of the civil service of a great country. [Applause.]

For once there has been some light thrown in, and the people of the country have an opportunity now to see the open door behind which there is a vast amount of information not yet brought to the knowledge of the country.

Now, in the very brief time I shall occupy I shall attempt to go back to the civil service of the country at the time of the adoption of this measure in 1883, and I shall put into my address extracts from the speeches of Governor Morton and the speech of Senator Ingalls, and from the declarations of the Secretary of the Treasury at that date, all of which I will put in, with the names and quotations properly given, in support of my proposition that at the date of the passage of this law in 1883 the civil service of this Government was a model in the estimation of every honest man and in the estimation of the people not only of this country but of the world.

I will show you that by the framers of this measure, the utterances in favor of the efficacy of the then civil service, it was so admitted on the record of both Houses of Congress. No man lifted up his voice to say that so far as benefiting the civil service of the Government there was the slightest necessity for this bill. I challenge any man on this floor to put his finger on an utterance of the character to which I have referred. Not only that, but the great leaders in the debate in both Houses, of both parties, the Secretary of the Treasury and the heads of the Departments, came forward with one voice and said that so far as their Departments were concerned they were run in the most efficient and valuable manner. What, then, was the demand? It came confessedly for a single purpose. We had had a long line of Republican administration, beginning in 1861.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman allow me one suggestion? He will find that in the hearings before the Appropriations Committee the declarations from the War Department and other Departments were that those temporary clerks were doing just as efficient service as those on the permanent roll.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I thank the distinguished gentleman. I should have come to that. But I am very much obliged, nevertheless.

What, then, was the object? We had had, as I was proceeding to say, a long line of Republican administration, and partisanship had assumed control, in effect, of all the Departments. We had gone from 1861 to 1883 without any Democratic administration; and Mr. Pendleton, the author of this bill, frankly said that his whole object was to bring about a division of offices between the Democrats and the Republicans. Nobody thought of any other proposition.

These gentlemen who to-day are exercising a power in this Government dangerous to the very principles of the Government never had a dream at that time that there was a necessity for anything else than a division of the offices. Mr. Pendleton so declared; and further than that, he was so uncertain in his own mind as to the efficacy of his bill that he put a limit upon the number of offices that it should cover, saying that not over 10,000 at the outside in the whole United States would be covered by it; and in urging the measure he advocated it as a tentative measure, saying that he hoped it might work well, but did not know whether it would or would not.

Mr. RICHARDSON. One suggestion, if the gentleman will allow it. The gentleman from Ohio was about as much responsible for the St. Louis platform as any other man in the country.

I should like to know why he consented to put in that platform a declaration in favor of the extension of the civil-service system?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, why has the gentleman from Tennessee acted the fool a great many times in the matter of platform making? [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. I confess I can not answer an argument like that.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Nor can I answer your question in any better way than that.

I have very often said on this floor that the details of these convention platforms make no impression upon anybody. There were two things at St. Louis that we were looking after; and when we had got those into the platform we cared but little about the declarations which might be made by the little fellows who went about "declaring."

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman's remark, as I understand, implies that he is wiser now than then.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I was as wise then as I am now.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the gentleman is wiser now than then, he must admit that the platform upon which Mr. Bryan made his campaign four years ago was founded in wisdom, because that platform did not advocate the extension of the civil-service system. So the gentleman can now be welcomed to a position on the Bryan platform.

Mr. GROSVENOR. God only knows whether that will be of any avail when the next campaign comes. [Laughter.]

But I do not want to consume my time on any extrinsic matter, as I have only seven minutes and a half left.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman will remember that the President in his letter of acceptance and in his inaugural address approved this civil-service system.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That straw has been thrashed out here so many times that my friend will allow me to say it is unworthy of him to bring it up again when there is so much new straw that could be thrashed out just as well.

Now, I have pointed out that it was never claimed by the friends of the original civil-service bill, first, that it was needed because of the condition of the public service, or, second, that it was anything but a tentative measure for the purpose I have indicated. Now what is the condition? We have gone from 1883 down to the present time, and here comes this great committee of the House, and, speaking through the gentleman in charge of this bill, lays before the country a very faint and modest description of what we have come to. I heard a high officer of this Government, holding a position nearly up to a Cabinet position, say not very long ago that he would take a contract, and give bond to carry it out, to pay all the expenses of running these Departments in the city of Washington for 50 cents on the dollar of what they are costing to-day, and would grow to a millionaire's position every year that he could have the contract.

I quote the following from the debate of yesterday on this bill:

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I should like to have a little more information about the condition of the public service in the various Departments. I would ask the gentleman if he knows or can approximate the number of incompetent employees in any one of the Departments?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I should say that in the office of the Auditor for the War Department the statement shows that 10 per cent of the employees are—well, you might say, incompetent.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Ten per cent?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Their efficiency is very low.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Is there a like percentage of incompetency in all the other Departments?

Mr. HEMENWAY. In the General Land Office the Commissioner, Mr. Hermann, estimates that 40 out of 400 are incompetent.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is 10 per cent.

Mr. HEMENWAY. That is 10 per cent. Here are two very competent officials whom I have selected from the list—the Auditor for the War Department and the Commissioner of the General Land Office. Their estimates show 10 per cent of incompetent employees.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And the chiefs of these various Departments make that admission in letters addressed to your committee, do they?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Well, either in hearings before our committee or in letters.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And do they confess their inability to correct that evil?

Mr. HEMENWAY. They confess their inability to correct the evil.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Under the operation of the civil-service laws are they not required to discharge incompetent men from the public service?

Mr. HEMENWAY. They are, but like all of us they are human, and while I have no desire to criticize Members of the House or Senators of the United States, when a number of Senators and Members of Congress come to these gentlemen and insist that an employee shall not be discharged, the gentleman can readily understand how difficult it is.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The bill reported by the gentleman carries an appropriation for the payment of these incompetent employees, I presume.

Mr. HEMENWAY. It certainly does, because the committee has no way of ascertaining who these persons are.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And no power to discharge them, of course.

Mr. HEMENWAY. No power to discharge, and we are simply bringing this fact before the House that they may understand the conditions. The Committee on Appropriations, by inserting the provisions found in section 4, on page 124 of the bill, has undertaken, by repeating what is now the law, to call attention to this condition and to bring about the discharge of these incompetent employees.

Mr. SHATTUC. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HEMENWAY. In just a moment. I will read section 4 of the bill.

"That the appropriations herein made for the officers, clerks, and persons

employed in the public service shall not be available for the compensation of any persons permanently incapacitated for performing such service."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Where is that provision to be found?

Mr. HEMENWAY. That is on page 124 of the bill. The committee seeks by this provision to call attention to what is now the law, and thereby to prevent the payment, out of sums appropriated by this bill, for the services of incompetent employees; but gentlemen may stand here and talk about this during this session of Congress and the coming session of Congress, and the incompetent employees will stay in the Department. If the head of a Department goes to a chief clerk and down the line to try to ascertain who are incompetent, I will say to you that he has a very hard job, because they do not try to aid him in picking out the incompetent employees. And why?

Mr. SHATTUC. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HEMENWAY (continuing). Because they are there together, they have been there together for years; friendships there are just as they are here; and they are not going to try to get the old incompetent fellow out that has been there for many years. We have got to have some legislation upon this question that will remedy this evil; and if we do not, it is going to keep on growing and growing until we are going to have a great civil pension list.

Mr. SHATTUC. Is it not your opinion, if the heads of the Departments should dismiss these men and put in the men that Congressmen and Senators recommend, that the Senators and Congressmen would not ask them to keep these incompetent people?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I have no doubt that is correct, because when you give them the right to employ another man they would recommend competent men.

Mr. SHATTUC. Would it not be better for spoilsmen to recommend men who would be competent rather than to keep the incompetent men in the way they are now being kept?

Mr. HEMENWAY. In reply to the gentleman's question, I can only say, with reference to this temporary force that has been employed, it is admitted by those who favor civil service and are at the heads of the different Departments that this temporary force, placed there within the last two or three years, is a very competent force; that they are more competent than the force secured through the civil service. They are younger men, men better qualified for the particular service to which they are assigned, and all along the line more efficient than the force secured through the civil service.

Mr. PEARRE. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Does he think it likely that the heads of the Departments and bureaus will appoint more competent men to the positions than those recommended by Members of Congress and Senators; in other words—

Mr. HEMENWAY. In reply to that, I will say that when they ask for the appointment of any particular class, they designate the kind of a man they want. If they want an accountant, they say to the gentleman, "Will you furnish me an accountant?" and if they want an accountant you would not send them a laborer. It is the experience that Members of Congress and Senators, if given the opportunity to furnish a particular kind of man, furnish that kind.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That being the case, does not the gentleman think there ought to be established an age limit, on attaining which employees should be retired, just as there is an age limit in the Army and Navy?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do. Although I believe in the present civil-service system, yet I will say that if we do not do something to meet this question of superannuation the service will break down.

Mr. WACHTER. I should like to know if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] can inform us what percentage of these incompetent employees are females?

Mr. HEMENWAY. We have no information on that subject.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman from Indiana allow me to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] a question?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I supposed that I was through with the gentleman from Ohio on this question.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has stated that the Commissioner of Pensions has said that if he could only discharge 100 clerks and fill the remaining places with persons of his own selection he could thereby greatly benefit the service. Now, does not the gentleman admit that the Commissioner of Pensions can not do this under the beautiful, far-reaching administration of the civil-service law; that where the removal of incompetent employees is desired there must be a trial before a sort of court, with a prescribed set of rules, to act upon each one of these individual cases?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. In answer to the gentleman from Ohio I will say that I believe the provision to which he refers, but which I do not understand to go to the extent he describes, was an unwise provision. But I do not understand that there is any difficulty in the way of the head of a Department discharging any of his subordinates if he will certify that they are incompetent.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Is there not an Executive order forbidding that identical thing being done?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do not so understand.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Was not such a provision inserted within a year upon the demand of the civil-service organization?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do not so understand. I do understand that a man can not be discharged except for cause stated, and after an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Very good; that is just what I said.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. But I venture to say that if the head of a Department, who is responsible for his work, undertakes to assert that the man is incompetent, that would be a sufficient reason for discharge. If that is not so, it is time Congress should go to work and make it so.

Mr. GROSVENOR. We know they should; but they will not do it. The idea of the gentleman from Massachusetts seems to be that if the head of a Department will only assert himself he may repeal the order of the Executive forbidding him to do what he undertakes to do.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do not so understand the matter at all.

And nobody doubts that any business concern in the country could take this entire concern under its administration and for 50 cents on the dollar do all that is done now and do it in a much more satisfactory manner.

Let us see. Ten per cent in the War Department; 100 worthless clerks in the Pension Office; 10 per cent on an average throughout the entire Departments. And now comes the Committee on Appropriations. Would any of these gentlemen go upon the witness stand and testify that 10 per cent of worthless clerks is the limit? Far from it. And yet when we come to cross-examine the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Indiana we find, first, that the Departments refuse to report the names of these inefficient clerks; second, they refuse to obey the

law which requires them to discharge such clerks; and third, that there is no system by which they can be discharged without a proceeding that is mortifying to the helpless clerk and disgusting to the chiefs of Departments.

The order of the Executive that compels written charges and a hearing is equivalent to a trial in every case, and he who turns off a clerk on any ground other than that violates the statute of his country. That is all there is about it, and that order was made upon the demand of the civil-service organization of the United States. I have their address, in which Mr. Carl Schurz and others declared that without that order the civil-service law was inoperative, because the heads of Departments might discharge without giving the reasons for it. And so at last that, as one of the improvements of the organization, stands across the pathway of any removal except for cause, that cause to be stated in writing and the party to have a hearing upon that question of cause.

Now, what is the answer to all this? Why do they not discharge them? For a very good reason, gentlemen. No chief of a bureau would consent, with his eyes wide open, to-day, to discharge even an inefficient clerk who had some knowledge of the routine of the office and trust to an academic competitive examination to fill the place. That is the whole of it. That is where the whole evil comes. It comes of the fact that these Departments are unwilling to hazard the result of an application to this Bureau that has the patronage of the Government by the throat and is administering it in a way that ought to be condemned by every honest man in this country. [Applause.]

That is the reason why the Departments suffer the evils that they have "rather than fly to others that they know not of." That is the whole of it, and we must come forward as the representatives of the people and abate this nuisance or we will never have it abated. What is the answer to it all? I stand upon the platform of the Evans bill of the last Congress, a measure that covered all the clerical service of this Government here, covered all the clerical force in the Railway Mail Service of the United States, covered all the great post-offices and custom-houses of the country, and simply provided for a tenure of office such as you have, a tenure of office such as the President has, a tenure of office such as the Senate has, and then provided at the end of the four or six years the young fellow might go out and go home, unless the chief of his bureau or his Department desired his retention, and provided for a bureau to examine as to his fitness.

It is true, as the gentleman from Georgia has said, that there never was a more efficient set of clerks ever put into the Departments in Washington than the temporary clerks under the Army bill. There is no more efficient service in all this country than these men have made here. Why does not the Civil Service Bureau, that has made war upon these clerks in every possible way, and tried to drive them out, tried to prevent their promotion, done everything to humiliate them that they possibly could—why do they not come forward and point out to the people of the country some failure in that service, which came upon the recommendation of Congressmen and went into the Departments to rescue the Government from the hands of the inefficiency that had cursed the Departments for so, these many years? Why did they not point out where some of these men have failed?

I tell you, my countrymen, I shall not agitate this question very much longer. I do not care very much about it. I care nothing about it from a personal standpoint. But when I see 25 per cent, 30 per cent, 40 per cent, 50 per cent of this enormous expenditure of my country's money paid out to uphold a mere theory that has no foundation in practical justice or practical effect, I am disgusted with the whole subject of the administration of the Civil Service Bureau, and the people of this country will inquire into it some of these days, and they will inquire into it in a way much more effective than the passage of the Evans bill would have been, and the time will come when the advocates of this measure that has thus ruined the administration of these Departments will wish that they had accepted the Evans bill as a just compromise, rather than to have made war and carried on this devastation against the best interests of the country. [Applause.]

Under the permission to extend my remarks, I reproduce in support of my argument here portions of a speech which I had the honor to make upon this subject in the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fifth Congress on the 19th day of July, 1897:

THE ORIGINAL CIVIL-SERVICE LEGISLATION—THE PRESENT PRACTICE A WIDE AND UNJUSTIFIED DEPARTURE.

Mr. Chairman, I come now to discuss, in connection with the aggressions and growth of this bureaucracy the original idea of the promoters of this legislation. Had there been a suggestion to Congress in 1883 that this law would have been construed as it has been and the power of the Civil Service Commission have grown until it denounced the President and Cabinet officers and Congress, it would not have received 10 votes in either branch of the legislative body, and I make this statement in the light of the proof before us.

The original effort, following the law of 1853, was the effort of

Mr. Jenckes, who played to the public galleries in 1866-67. He struggled on and on, and encountered defeat in the Thirty-ninth Congress by a vote of 72 to 66 in the House, 52 members refusing to vote. This chimerical system, which has since grown into an enactment, was spit upon by the distinguished members of Congress of that day, and it is pleasant now to consider that among the great statesmen of the hour who voted to table the whole business we find the names of Mr. Blaine, Mr. Kasson, Senator Wilson, Secretary Windom, Senator ALLISON, and Mr. Boutwell, while Conkling and Garfield refused to vote.

At that time Mr. Jenckes was challenged over and over again to bring forward any reason why such a law was to be passed. He was never able to do it, and finally, after his defeat, as above stated, he abandoned the field, so far as Washington and the Departments were concerned, and undertook to try and reach inefficiency, as he called it, in the customs and internal-revenue service. After the defeat and death of Mr. Jenckes, Mr. Schurz, who has never refused an office from any party, no matter what its principles were, brought the same bill into the Senate, but it was side-tracked by a production of Senator Trumbull, entitled "An act to prevent importunity and to maintain the independence of the Departments." "Senators wanted one thing," as has been well said by another, "but the civil-service 'reformers' wanted another, and finally they both joined hands, but for different objects, to reach the same result."

Mr. Ham, a most able and lucid writer upon this subject, has recently published a small pamphlet in which he reviews, with historic accuracy, the rise and promotion of this heresy. The Albany (N. Y.) Evening Journal quotes Mr. Ham with the following indorsement:

Mr. Ham treats the subject of civil-service reform, modeled after the English experiment, intelligently and candidly.

This candid writer says:

DENUNCIATION OF SPOILSMEN.

At this juncture the most alarming statements were made in the public press and on the stump concerning the condition of the civil service. It was alleged to be corrupt, inefficient, and wholly under the control of Congress, and the country was flooded with untrue, unjust, and most malicious allegations and insinuations. The people were told that the country had come under the yoke of an office-holding oligarchy (Grant) and that its power was poisoning the vitals of the Republic. Every man who failed to fall down and worship at the British "competitive" shrine set up in the market places by Dorman B. Eaton was denounced as a "spoilsman," and the very air was pregnant with the clamor of the demagogue and the applause of those who innocently followed in the wake of ambitious politicians cloaked in the garb of civil-service "reformers," while bells were tolled to warn the people against danger from the "officeholders" under General Grant.

Let us glance at the situation and conditions which existed about this time. The nation had just emerged from a death struggle to maintain its own existence. To raise the needed revenue, obtain supplies, and distribute them promptly to vast armies called into the field a large number of officeholders not needed in time of peace. Contractors were a necessary evil, and coming in contact with the peace contingent in office, abuses outside the Departments may have come to infest the public service. The impetus of the war force was so great, and the peril so imminent, that the final result found the Government generously tardy in coping with evils which had crept in and attached themselves like barnacles to places invested with more or less power; millions of war and other claims remained to be adjusted, and the new system of internal-revenue taxation had become necessary.

Heavy amounts of revenue were and would long require to be raised, not only to repair losses, but to reward patriotism and to pay our indebtedness. A large force must be kept employed, and, for the reasons stated, it was not entirely clean. This abnormal situation brought to the surface a lot of theorists, ambitious demagogues—reformers, some of whom were jealous of the civil and military personnel in power—who, in Congress and at the front, had carried the nation successfully through a great war. The conditions became ripe and the moment favorable to commence an agitation for anything that promised "reform."

Only a month or two after General Lee's surrender a select committee on "retrenchment" was raised in the House to investigate matters, and there was a suggestion in the resolve that the inquiry extend to the subject of appointments to office, to the examination of persons for place, and to the policy of continuing them in office for a fixed term. That was the original idea, and, aside from Mr. Jenckes's effort, that was the starting point of the present civil-service law.

A train of abuses is the inevitable result of a civil war; they would have been gradually removed without "competitive" examinations, because the trouble was not so much in the Departments as outside of them, but "civil-service reform" was sprung upon the people who were bearing heavy burdens, and they were made to believe—by diligent efforts—that the remedy lay in this pretended reform. Petitions were circulated, editorials written, and speeches made which finally resulted in an educated clamor for the civil-service scheme that was eventually foisted upon the people. Public men who had labored hard during the war in Congress and had grown weary began to gradually favor something—anything—which would relieve them from the "importunity" of those who desired places. These men were not brought to take this elixir because they either deemed the "competitive" idea necessary or that it contained the elevating, eradicating, and purifying qualities claimed for it by the civil-service reformers. It simply furnished the machinery to relieve men from importunity.

For five years—from 1866 to 1871—the House of Representatives persistently refused to accept the civil-service idea, but the people had been plied with all sorts of statements relating to the public service, and they finally took alarm. Not one in ten thousand, however, comprehended what the "reform" meant. Some interpreted it to signify a decrease in taxation and the purifying of the public service and as much more as an active and imaginary mind could be wrought to conceive. But Congress refused to move, until finally the "competitive" idea was hitched on as a "rider" to a sundry civil appropriation bill during the last hours of the session of 1870.

To attach this scheme to an appropriation bill smacked of unfair method. The motion to lay it on the table escaped defeat in the Senate by barely 1 vote, and it was accepted by the House under protest from General Logan and by a minority vote. It is known as section 1753 of the Revised Statutes,

and remains in force. It thrust upon the President a responsibility which he did not desire and in a form which he did not suggest. The President had felt the pressure of "importunity" and wished to get relief therefrom, but above all he regarded the real evil to be the careless recommendations of persons for place by Senators and Representatives almost inevitable during the war.

In December, 1870, President Grant said that in mercantile pursuits "the business man who gives a letter of recommendation to a friend to enable him to obtain credit of a stranger is regarded as morally responsible for the integrity of his friend and his ability to meet his obligations. A reformatory law which would enforce that principle against all indorsers of persons for public place would insure great caution in making recommendations."

There was assuredly no "competitive" idea conveyed in that suggestion—no indorsement in it to prevent "importunity" even; no intimation that it was necessary.

TACTICS OF THE REFORMERS.

But the scheme had obtained a footing, and the reformers became supposedly entrenched behind a law which left its success or failure to rest upon the President. They at once determined to hold him, rather than themselves, responsible for any failure of the experiment; and the work of denouncing every man who declined to accept their civil-service elixir or "competitive" compound was begun with renewed vigor, at Government expense, in reports to the President. The word "reform" had been used to thrust upon the country something which the people did not want nor understand.

JACKSON AS AN EXAMPLE.

Even the idea of using the word "reform" in the manner stated was not original. That word was just as effectually employed during the Administrations of Adams and Jackson by politicians to secure Jackson's election, and to excuse his removals from office, as the modern civil-service reformers used it to bring the "competitive" idea to the statute book.

Some modern "reformers" there were who hoped the cry would capture Republicans, tear them away from their party, build up the "Liberal" movement, perhaps make Carl Schurz President. They were simply handling the word "reform" as it had been used in the days of Benton, Clay, and Calhoun; just as Mr. Benton raised a "select committee on executive patronage" in 1826 under cover of a desire to reform the civil service. He and his friends then pretended to believe that the ship of state was about to go to pieces on the rock of "patronage," and danger signals were hoisted on every hilltop and kept brightly burning. The people were told that unless something was done the nation would surely go to the demnition bowwows without confession or prayer. The cry went up that the President had too much power; the civil-service reformer of more modern times tells us that the average Senator and Representative had too much influence.

The Jackson adherents wanted their man and their principles and policy to prevail, and they raised the civil-service "reform" war cry. Jackson came to power in 1829, and six years later, in 1835-36, Clay and Calhoun combined and raised a select committee on civil-service reform. Calhoun had fallen out of line because of his stand on nullification; and, if ambitious, he also desired to punish Jackson.

The wording of the Calhoun-Clay resolve was so similar with that known as the Jenckes resolution in 1866-67 that it seems easy to divine whence the latter came. Cursory examination will convince the most skeptical that the civil-service reformers of 1866-1883 drew all their inspiration as to pretended need and necessity for civil-service reform in this country from the reports made by Benton in 1826-27, and Clay and Calhoun in 1835-36.

The Calhoun-Clay report in 1835-36 alleged that honest and capable men were dismissed to make room for the base and corrupt; that the offices were made the spoils of victory, the reward of partisan service, and the means of substituting man worship for patriotism. To these allegations the reformers of 1866-1883 added but two ideas: That the civil service was inefficient and the importunity of constituents exasperating. Benton met the attack of 1835 by saying that it proceeded from political animosities and was unfounded; that the charges emanated from barnacles who had been removed by Jackson.

Mr. Calhoun pointed out to Benton that his position was quite inconsistent with the language of his (Benton's) report in 1826, when the latter and his friends were assailing Adams, and the point made by the South Carolina Senator was well taken. Silas Wright was on the floor of the Senate and made sport of the fears expressed in the Clay-Calhoun report leveled at Jackson. He said:

"How are most of these officeholders appointed? Upon the recommendations and petitions of the people themselves, upon certificates of character, respectability, and moral worth, made by those who are neighbors and friends of the candidate, who know him personally and intimately, and most usually on the recommendation of the Representatives here of the person appointed. Are we, then, to assume that offices are bestowed as rewards for partisan service, without respect to merit?"

William L. Marcy's familiar remark, which the advocates of civil-service reform so delight to recall from its slumbers, viz, that "to the victors belong the spoils," contained a very essential appendage, which is always suppressed. Mr. Wright added, "but I do not mean to say that the victors should plunder their own camp." A very important qualification, indeed; one that carries a complete refutation of the construction generally placed on his original remark by the civil-service people.

In other words, while the political party which succeeds has a right to the offices—in order to enforce its policy and its principles upon the country, if it can—the argument was, and is, that its appointees have generally been men of character, honesty, and merit, not only that they might best serve the public interests, but to accomplish the purpose indicated; and in the very nature of things the best, the strongest, and most positive men were, as a rule, appointed. No political party will "plunder its own camp," and thus endanger its power by selecting dishonest, corrupt, or inefficient persons to hold office in time of peace.

COLLAPSE OF THE ORIGINAL IDEA.

The original law of 1871 provided that the President might "prescribe such regulations for the admission of persons into the civil service of the United States as may best promote efficiency," etc. Following the passage of that act came the zealous efforts of the reformers to prepare rules and regulations to make the scheme work out their theories. They failed, and the competitive idea finally collapsed in 1875-76. The President, General Grant, said distinctly in his message of December, 1875, that—

If Congress adjourns without positive legislation on the subject of civil-service reform, I will regard such action as a disapproval of the system and will abandon it. Competitive examinations will be abandoned.

Congress, wisely and deliberately, and with its eyes wide open, did adjourn without any "positive legislation." Now, in this connection it is important to see whether or not the allegations of corruption and inefficiency alleged against the Republican Admin-

istration of that day were true or false. This child of despotism was born of those declarations; whatever there is of it now had its birth and origin because of the declarations made that in 1875-76 there was a condition in the Departments at Washington that required an enactment of this character.

There was not one officer of the General Government, nor bureau, that did not denounce as an outrage the slanders upon which these proceedings were based, and it was not strange to the men of those days that slanders should emanate from certain of the sources promoting this alleged reform. The Third Auditor of the Treasury said that the clerks appointed by competitive examination were not superior to those appointed in the old way. The Supervising Architect said that the civil-service law had led to demoralization, rivalries, and intrigues, and that no examination was of any value compared with practical tests, and he advised the repeal of so much of the law as had at that time been passed into enactment, to wit, section 1753 of the Revised Statutes.

The New York naval officer said that the examinations resorted to under the old system were the means of introducing into the service appointees equally as efficient as any appointed under the civil-service law.

The First Comptroller of the Treasury said "the evils from it exceeded the benefits."

The Third Assistant Postmaster-General said that the law "fell short of properly or satisfactorily filling its mission;" but, as this writer has well said, this fusillade was kept up, and the words "spoilsman," "henchmen," "patronage," and "reform" were sung and echoed throughout the halls of Congress and throughout the air which surrounded politicians out of jobs, who had traded on their influence in the campaign preceding 1877.

Then came a determined effort, which unfortunately failed, to get rid of this whole business and go back to the simpler and more effective terms of the law of 1853, as amended. In 1872 Senator Carpenter, of Wisconsin, one of the great leaders of the Republican party, moved an amendment to an appropriation bill to repeal that law. It failed by a slender majority of 8. But in 1874 the House of Representatives did attach an amendment to repeal the civil-service law of 1871. The Senate refused to concur, but moved to amend by striking it out and to give \$15,000 to enforce the law, and in conference the action of both branches failed and civil-service reform substantially came to a dead stop. The effect was, is, and remains that the competitive system was abandoned and denounced all along its pathway up to this date.

THE REAL OBJECT OF THE LAW.

The real object of the law, it was claimed at the time, was to make men in public stations accountable for their recommendations, and Senator Morrill said that he desired to prevent intoxication among employees; and yet, as Mr. Ham has well said:

The average civil-service reformer of to-day will say that the one great purpose of the act of 1871 was to bring greater efficiency to the service; to destroy the patronage power of the politician. With this contrariety of ideas it is little wonder that the competitive idea of 1871 came to an untimely end. Senators did not concede that there was corruption or inefficiency in the grades which the law would reach.

No greater scandal or outrage was ever perpetrated upon the fair name of the American people than at the beginning of the civil-service law. There was no necessity for greater efficiency or purer morals in the Departments at Washington or in the great bureaus in other cities.

The Senators of 1871 made swift progress to denounce the whole business, and addressing himself to the Trumbull bill in that year Senator Morton, of Indiana, one of the great leaders of the Republican party, said:

It is said that there are a large number of incompetent and worthless clerks employed. Is that true? I believe the clerks here are as competent and as well qualified, and men of as good character, as can be found in any country. I believe our civil service is now conducted as well if not better than at any former period of our history. We have gone on improving and reforming, and the civil service is getting better from year to year.

Senator Cameron, the great champion of the party in Pennsylvania, said:

Take them all together, I do not believe there is a more efficient, a more honest, a more useful, and a worse paid body of people than these clerks.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Richardson, who was appealed to and who was in that year a man of courage, who was in that year a man who was not afraid of the babble and bluster of the noisy element in the country, said:

The business in the Treasury, upon the whole, is not only done in a satisfactory manner, but it will compare in accuracy and efficiency with the business of the country generally which is carried on by corporations and individuals.

He also affirmed "that the removals were no greater than was needed to insure vigor and infuse new life in the Department."

At that time the high priest, who, I believe, had not yet deserted his political party, although he was, perhaps, making ready and looking out for later engagements, said:

Whether the Departments at Washington are well or badly managed was an insignificant question.

Baffled and completely routed in his assaults upon the Government and upon the departmental service in Washington, he said that it was a matter of insignificance whether they were well or badly run. They were to be reformed whether there was any reform needed or not. In this connection it is well to quote what Representative Baker, of New Hampshire, said recently in a speech in this House:

Why, gentlemen, years ago I had the honor of serving in one of these Departments. I know what its personnel was from 1865 to 1874 by actual contact with it, and, by business and other relations with that Department, I have known it ever since, and I tell you that there has never been, in the history of the Treasury Department, a time when it was so well managed, when it had clerks of such ability who so honestly and faithfully discharged their duties as during that so-called "spoils" time from 1865 to 1875.

Then came a little tinkering of the law in a legislative appropriation bill of August 15, 1876, and then came the great struggle to create public sentiment, and Mr. Ham has so well stated the unjust and libelous efforts that were made in that direction that I reproduce his remarks:

This only seemed to whet the keen appetite of the reformers, who commenced a systematic siege, and for several years in public print, in conventions, meetings, and on the stump, it was sought to create a sentiment which would justify a second appeal to Congress, of sufficient proportions to terrify and bulldoze the legislative branch into passing an elaborate act. Accordingly in 1877 Mr. Hayes was prevailed upon to allow Mr. Eaton to show how "competitive" examinations had worked in England and here. That gentleman labored on a brochure of 266 printed pages about two years and four months, at a good salary, going back to the Norman invasion and tracing the rise, progress, and causes of abuses in the British Empire, desiring, of course, to have the country assume that what had proceeded from the rule of English tyrants and feudalism existed here also or was likely to be precipitated upon this country, unless the "competitive" panacea was applied at once. It was a report calculated and intended to excite and alarm, but it had no application whatever to the existing conditions of our civil service. And the suggestion which it conveyed, to wit, that the abuses in England had been eradicated by civil-service "competitive" examinations was the weakest feature of his historical effort. Mr. Eaton's report showed that Parliament was under the sway, practically, of 160,000 voters. In some districts 10, 13, or 35 persons controlled an election. The rotten borough system there was in full blast. Ninety members went up to Parliament on a total vote of but 4,500. Three lords controlled 31 members of the Commons. Of over 50 persons foisted on the Government between 1837 and 1855, several were found absolutely incompetent because of old age; titled barnacles, spoken of by Mr. Dickens.

Many others of the 50 were found entirely unqualified for diverse other reasons, such as bad character, ill health, and some could neither read nor write. Of 290 persons examined under the old system in 1855 in England, 285 were rejected because of ignorance in spelling and arithmetic. There was assuredly need of education in England—even if it had to come under the guise of "competitive" examinations. But the scholastic effort to draw a parallel between the situation there and here was devoid of truth in its suggestion and lacking in true American pride. It was an insinuating libel upon the United States, printed at Government expense.

But this did not succeed, and no civil-service law grew out of it. A well-known and distinguished civil-service reformer assailed Mr. Dawes, a Senator from Massachusetts, to know why the law had not been passed, and Mr. Dawes said, "How can you expect a law to be passed by Congress when the constituents of Congress do not want it?" And one of the theorists of that day said: "Of course I know that it is true that no law which is very much in advance of the prevailing tone of public morality is ever effectually executed. It will not execute itself."

Mr. Dawes said, in that connection, "We can not get the legislation and make it permanent unless our constituents behind us will support us in it. We never rise higher than the fountain;" and thereupon a cheap-John stereotype system of printed headings and the old, old style of petitions, signed promiscuously in country stores and post-offices and everywhere, poured in upon Congress as an evidence of a growing public sentiment.

Now came the partial sanction of the civil-service-reform movement. It did not originate in the House of Representatives; it never came from any immediate representatives of the people, but it had its origin in the Senate of the United States. Its progenitor ostensibly was Mr. Pendleton. It has been well said, and is true, that the bill containing the competitive scheme was handed to Mr. Pendleton, and was reported favorably, devoid of sections 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14, which really contain all of reform there is in the civil-service law.

The Senate amended the bill as reported by adding the above sections; 11, 12, 13, and 15 coming from Senator HAWLEY, who now has views on this great question, and section 14 from the late Senator Beck. Mr. Pendleton never drafted a line of the experiment. As Senator Miller said:

The bill is the joint work of a number of educated gentlemen who are organized for the purpose of promoting a reform in the civil service.

Senator Ingalls said:

This bill is not devised by either political party in the Senate; it was sent here by a self-constituted commission of exceedingly holy and wise men outside the Senate. It does not represent the sentiment of either of the political parties in this body. I know who drew up this bill; I know who sent it here, and I know the motives and the incentives that are being used to pass it.

And he added:

This bill appears to be supported by each party for the purpose of cheating the other. It is sustained by one party upon grounds that are absolutely adverse to those on which it is supported by the other, and it will end by defrauding both.

And who will say that to-day the intelligent, far-seeing, and shrewd men of all political parties do not recognize that they have

and their constituents have and the country has been cheated by this bill?

Senator Logan said:

I do not protest against certain Senators constantly discussing this question, based upon the corruption of the clerical force of this country, because it has no foundation in fact.

But Mr. Pendleton then and there waved a flag of compromise which alone saved the bill, by declaring:

It has been said that the abandonment of the spoils system will retain in office the appointments of the Republican party. I do not think so. There is no proposition to extend the term of office nor anywise to limit the power of removal.

But to-day the Civil Service Commissioners demand that the power of removal shall be limited by an Executive order which the Executive has no constitutional power to issue, and in a recent article in the Forum the chairman of the executive committee of the National Civil Service Association says that the weak spots in the law as it stands to-day are, first, that there is no power of removal and, in fact and by inference, that no Presidential order can limit the power of the appointing heads of the Departments from making removals with or without cause, excepting in so far as the President can coerce the judgment and action of his Cabinet; and second, that there is no provision for the disabled; that is, there is no civil-pension list. As I have already said, that will be the next step needed. The step has already been taken by the honorable chairman of the Civil Service Committee of this House.

I shall here incorporate some of the pertinent discussions when this bill was pending. These choice excerpts are collated from speeches of HAWLEY, Pendleton, and Sherman, and has been well expressed by Senator MORGAN in the following:

Is not "importunity" the great evil against which we have to contend?

So it appears that—

The object of Senators on both occasions was relief against the importunities of those who desired places. The competitive scheme would throw all the minor office hunters upon the Civil Service Commission. It was not that competitive examinations were necessary. That idea would simply furnish the machinery which would attain the other desired result. And the consequence was that, independently of the competitive scheme, its machinery would defend men from "importunity."

That is to say, distinguished Senators who had risen upon the wave of results achieved by the working men of their party at home wanted to put a legal barrier between the importunities for reward of their constituents who had made them great. This was the declared position; but General HAWLEY, the gallant old soldier, hero, and statesman of Connecticut, has said, as stated by Mr. Ham, and I quote a considerable amount of the collation of that indefatigable writer:

Nine-tenths of those who do the headwork in the great political campaigns at home, in town and county and State committees, and who are at the polls distributing ballots, serving as counters, running out to bring in voters, and attending to correspondence are men who serve with no care for, no thought nor expectation of ever holding a political office. Nine-tenths of the men who subscribe money for the honorable uses of a campaign are of the same description. There has been a deal of unlimited and nonsensical abuse on that subject.

Why should Senators and Representatives erect a barrier between themselves and these men and the public service, seek the labor and financial assistance even of party friends, and then be able to turn about and say, in answer to a request for a position, "Oh, I can't help you; all the places are under the civil service." They ought to add—even if it is a whisper—"which I helped to enact and now vote to continue." Ex-Senator Vilas gave the snap away when he said on the floor of the Senate April 7, 1896: "The relief which has been enjoyed by Senators and Representatives, not to speak of those intrusted with the offices of the Government, is in itself a second item of great consequence."

It may be of great consequence for a Senator to be able to turn a constituent down with the leverage of a law of his own creation, but the Senator who gloried in it has himself been retired, and the people are ready to retire more who may think as he does.

But in what way are Senators and Representatives advantaged by this law, so far as it may tend to relieve them from "importunity?" Without a civil-service law they would be asked to secure "appointments." Under the law they are importuned to keep persons in and also to secure reinstatements. We think the law increases the volume of importunity.

It is by and through political parties that this Government has worked out its greatest achievements and advances—and all before civil-service reform had an existence! By and through parties come purification, exposures of wrong, and economies. Destroy one of the incentives which a small percentage of party workers have—reward for fidelity and zeal—and a republican form of government will gradually lapse into a state of coma. Political parties are the vitalizing forces of our system. They consist in part of workers and organizers not one in a thousand of whom seek Federal positions!

The strife between the comparatively few who do develop the unobjectionable and qualified person. The assumption is that unless competitive examination is resorted to we get incompetents. The whole country is full of qualified persons! Would Mr. Gage or any other bank president wanting a teller, cashier, note clerk, or other officer go to some "competitive" school for such an officer? And why not, as well as for a clerk in the Treasury?

So now it becomes pertinent to ascertain what was the real incentive of the Senators to pass the Pendleton bill. Was the civil service inefficient? I have already more than once commented; I shall continue to comment.

President Arthur said in 1881:

I declare my dissent from the severe and almost indiscriminate censure with which the present civil servants of the Government have been recently assailed. That they are, as a class, indolent, inefficient, and corrupt is a statement which has been often made and widely credited; but when the extent, variety, delicacy, and importance of their duties are considered, the

great majority of the employees of the Government are, in my judgment, deserving of high commendation.

"I protest vigorously against the extreme denunciation of the existing system of this country," said Mr. HAWLEY. "It has become a fashion very largely, among a class of men who have or claim for themselves a superior culture to the average, to speak of the whole public service of this country as corrupt. They have no right to such language. * * * I have an unutterable contempt for the man who justifies his neglect of his public duties by talking about the dirty waters of politics."

So the law was passed in fraud. It was conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity, for it is always iniquitous to intend to pass a law for one purpose when covertly and secretly you intend it shall operate for another purpose. It went through the House in fraud of the rights of the members of the House and the people whom they represent. It was never intended to cover anything but the Departments in Washington, and that alone in its application to the clerical force. Had any man in those days said that that law would be tortured to affect the appointment by the President himself of an assistant messenger in the White House, there would have been no vote in favor of it on the floor of the Senate. It was an experiment to be tried upon the clerks in the Departments. The whole line of debate shows it. Mr. Pendleton himself says:

I said that this was a tentative effort; that it was intended to be an experiment; and it is because it is tentative, because it is intended as an experiment, that the committee thought it advisable to limit it.

Limit it to what? Why, to the very subjects that we say to-day it is limited to. Pendleton, its author, understood it so; Pendleton, its putative father, knew what it meant.

In 1888 Mr. Cox said that when the Pendleton bill came over from the Senate the House was about to take up an important shipping bill, and he at once proposed to Mr. Kasson, of Iowa, that a vote be taken on the Pendleton bill without debate, and it was passed in that way, or, as Mr. Cox expressed it, "on the tidal wave of an emotion," and that emotion has emotionized out of office every Administration that has touched it with a single item, and its baneful effects are just being felt in this country; and here I quote from Mr. Ham what this experiment has cost the people of the United States:

As an "experiment" it has been used and abused as has no other law on the statute books. Specific details or cases to sustain this assertion will doubtless be forthcoming in due time; it is sufficient to now say that this has been done through the general rules, the special rules applicable to each Department, and the regulations, for be it known that the civil-service "trust," commission, or board of control of the Federal patronage, the three "bosses" over 87,000 places, and their predecessors, have erected a "machine" under those rules that would startle Tweed himself. Its original entrance or appointment rules, special rules for each Department, rules for transfer and promotions, and its regulations, and that delectable semipolitical "machine" in the Treasury for special or noncompetitive examinations, cover 53 pages of small type! Is it any wonder that Senators and Representatives "throw up their hands" when they attempt to discover what it all means?

The Departments were "blanketed" under civil-service reformer Cleveland to such an extent in the reach for jurisdiction that farmers and blacksmiths on Indian reservations and employees in sawmills, and cooks, even, are said to come within the rules. In fact, a doubt has arisen whether there are enough places "excepted" to satisfy even the very few remaining applicants from the State of Ohio!

Mr. LIVINGSTON. How much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has thirteen minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield it to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DRIGGS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DRIGGS] is recognized for thirteen minutes.

Mr. DRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions for three years, and I desire to say during that time I have not seen in that committee one particle of partisanship. Every bill brought in there, whether introduced by a Democrat or Republican, has been fairly, honorably, and squarely treated and considered. The Democrats have received as much consideration as have the Republicans. I believe the time has come when the country should understand what we do in the House at the Friday night sessions. The newspapers of the country say: "The pension mill in the House is again at work grinding out bills."

Mr. BELL. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. DRIGGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BELL. I should like to know how that committee works—

Mr. DRIGGS. I will come to that.

Mr. BELL. I should like to know how it is that some of us who have introduced a number of bills and who have made the proof in the very beginning of this session have not yet got a bill on this Calendar. I made my proof before the committee in the case of 75 bills; yet I have not been able to get one bill on the Calendar. I should like to know how that occurs.

Mr. DRIGGS. It is a pleasure for me to answer the gentleman.

At the commencement of this session the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions sent a notice to every member of this House that if he had any special preferences for any special bills, those bills would be given consideration in accordance with the request of the member.

Mr. BELL. Now, may I ask the gentleman again—

Mr. DRIGGS. I would rather not yield just now.

Mr. BELL. In the very beginning—

Mr. DRIGGS. I decline to yield now. I am coming to the gentleman's question.

There are in this committee members assigned to examine bills from the different States; and if any Representative on this side of the Chamber does not get his bills reported he will understand the reason. The committee meets on Monday and Friday of each week; and we go through the bills without any regard as to whether the member interested is a Democrat or a Republican. There are fifteen members of that committee when they are all present; and when the State of Colorado, for instance, is reached, the Representative having charge of bills from that State takes up those bills and gives them consideration after their examination by the pension expert sent us by the Pension Department and bases his report upon this expert evidence. I will ask the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL] whether I have answered his question.

Mr. BELL. I think you did.

Mr. DRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, the bills are then reported to the committee as a whole, acted upon, rejected or accepted, and placed upon the Calendar for the future consideration of the House. Each bill, sir, passes over five steps before going to the Senate, viz: Pension expert, subcommittee, whole committee, Committee of Whole House, and then the House. No bills considered in Congress pass through so devious and fair a course as those from our committee.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to send to the Clerk's desk and have read this editorial from the New York Times of February 12.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE PENSION ATTORNEYS' WORK.

It is well to remember that the enormous amount of pension legislation now being pressed in Congress is not the work of the soldiers as a class, nor even of a very great proportion of the soldiers. In very large part, the persons receiving or seeking pensions now are not soldiers, but the relatives of soldiers, and these have none of the sense of pride that generally is felt by those who have been in the military service.

Another considerable number of the present applicants for pension are men who deserted from the Army or in other ways forfeited their rights, or those who were mere camp followers and never exposed themselves to any danger. Back of this army of hungry and unscrupulous persons, or persons never really connected with the service, are the pension attorneys, more greedy and unprincipled than the clients they hunt up from all corners of the land. It is this class that are hounding Congress for the passage of the flood of private pension bills, almost every one of which enacts a claim that has been carefully and honestly examined in the Pension Bureau and rejected for good cause.

The whole theory of the special legislation on this subject is wrong. There are only a very few cases in which a pension should be paid except in accordance with general laws and on grounds fixed by these laws and capable of definite proof in compliance with the tests imposed by the Bureau. There is almost no claim that can be passed on by a committee of Congress so honestly, fairly, and wisely as by the trained and responsible officers of the Bureau. We do not know that there is any way of enforcing on Congress the application of this perfectly sound principle. It is not practicable to restrict the powers of Congress by statute, and if the committees and the two Houses choose to abuse their powers, as they continually do, they can not be prevented.

But it ought to be well understood by the country that their motives are not good, and that in the great body of cases they are not acting from reckless generosity, but selfishly. The pension attorneys are the organizers and managers of the so-called "soldier vote," and they menace with it every Congressman who stands in their way. Probably nine-tenths of the undeserved pensions voted in Congress are the product of this sort of blackmail, in which the pension sharks are experts. The only check on them is wholesome public opinion, mainly that of the real soldiers, and this is not sufficiently direct and well informed at present to have a decided influence. There has never been a time when Congress was so reckless and shameless in this direction.

Mr. DRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, this editorial of this great metropolitan daily is one of the most outrageous attacks upon Congress, upon the representatives of the people in Congress, and upon the members of the Committee on Invalid Pensions that I have ever read or heard of under the head of pension legislation. It is written with the purpose to deceive and mislead the American people on the subject of pension legislation. And I do not propose, either at this late hour of this day's session or in this late year in the history of our country, to talk on the subject as to whether pension legislation is advisable or unadvisable. But I do say this: That as a Democrat I believe in the volunteer soldiery of this country, and I believe the only way that we are going to be able to maintain and keep up the volunteer force of this country in any future wars that may occur is by standing by the pension principles laid down by the fathers when they established the first act providing for pensions, some five or six weeks (August 26, 1776) after the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the first part of this editorial states that it is well to remember that the pension legislation which is now before us is not the act of the old soldiers, but largely that of their relatives and people who have no real right to pensions under the law. I say that during the three years I have served on this Committee on Invalid Pensions every single case that we have considered has been that of an old soldier, his widow, or some one directly dependent upon that soldier—aged father or mother or helpless children. Desertion bills are not considered by us. It continues by stating that the pension attorneys appear before our

committee, and that we members of Congress are pushed forward to bring about this legislation in their behalf and not of the soldier—sort of a system of blackmail.

I say now that there has never been one single, solitary pension attorney before that committee to talk to or consult with us or to ask anything about any special pension legislation; and I say now that I, for one, if a pension attorney were to ask permission to appear before that committee on any special bill, would be one of the first to vote in the committee against giving him the privilege to appear there, because the old soldiers themselves take up the time of that committee. Our fellow-Representatives of this House come before us on behalf of this soldier and that soldier; it is their duty and their right to come; it is our pleasure to listen to them as they stand up to defend old soldiers who ask nothing but simple justice and fair treatment.

Mr. SIMS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. DRIGGS. Certainly. I am always willing to yield to so courteous a member as my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. SIMS. As a member of Congress, is it not your experience that the applications coming to you to file bills for private pensions are usually accompanied by a letter of some pension attorney, who has told the man that he can not get a pension under the law and that he must go to Congress?

Mr. DRIGGS. Most emphatically, no, sir; that is not my experience.

Mr. SIMS. That is my experience, and I have the letters which will show it.

Mr. DRIGGS. I have never received a letter like that, and I have received letters from a great many old soldiers. I do not know the experiences of other members of this House, but speaking for myself, I do not recall that I have ever received a letter from a pension attorney in reference to one of these private pension bills.

Mr. SIMS. I do not mean a letter to the member, but a letter to the applicant, which he files with his letter.

Mr. DRIGGS. That may be, but they never come to me.

Now I will go on. They say this is a system of blackmail, that the old-soldier vote is held over the head of every Representative on the floor of this House if he does not vote for liberal pensions.

I desire, Mr. Chairman, to go away back to one of the early Congresses and read to you the resolution which organized and authorized the establishment of the Committee on Invalid Pensions. It was found away back in 1830 that Congress had not the time to consider all pension claims which came before it; therefore in this Congress—that is, the Twenty-first Congress—in the second session, it decided to do away with one committee on pensions and erect two, and thus a resolution was passed under which this Committee on Invalid Pensions was organized. In that Congress Mr. Trezevant, a member, moved the following resolution on the 5th day of January, 1831:

That a committee shall be added to the standing committees, to be appointed at the commencement of each session, which shall be called the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and whose duty it shall be to take into consideration all such matters respecting invalid pensions as shall be referred to them by the House.

That resolution, then adopted, has continued in force from that on to this, very nearly seventy years, and during all that time it has been the duty of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to consider—what? To consider claims where an applicant for pension, not able, through some peculiar technicality in the law or some very singular decision of the medical referee, or the impossibility of producing sufficient evidence to prove his case, was to have the right to come to Congress as a court of last resort and ask our relief for their disability thus placed upon them in the Pension Bureau; and as such a committee—committee of last resort—the Committee on Invalid Pensions has done their duty to this House, to their constituencies, to their country, and its Treasury. Were we to report a bill favorably to this House at any one of these pension sessions which we had not investigated and considered thoroughly, and considered earnestly, and considered justly, we would not be entitled to the fair consideration of this House or the nation, because we would not have been performing our duty either capably or honestly.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that the members of this House find it almost impossible from the reading of the reports as they are read from the desk, to understand all the different salient features of each one of these measures. I know, and I repeat, in our committee no bill can possibly pass through unless it has first passed the eyes of the expert examiner from the Pension Bureau, and after passing his eyes it then goes to the subcommittee, and the subcommittee carefully considers the brief which the pension expert has drawn, and then we decide in accordance with the resolution which established the Committee on Invalid Pensions as to whether the applicant is entitled to relief or not.

In every case reported to this House in the Fifty-fifth Congress the committee unanimously reported, and the reports were accepted and adopted by the House of Representatives without the

changing or amending of a single report, and when they went over to the other end of this Capitol there were but 26 or 27 bills that went to a conference, showing that the two committees had done their work and that the Senate and the House had agreed to pension measures almost absolutely and unanimously. No blackmail or threats here, sir, for many members have no bills before us.

I would say, in addition, Mr. Chairman, we realize that these applications to Congress for relief are increasing, that in each year there are more and more of them. I desire to show, Mr. Chairman, why it is that these applications that have been coming into Congress are increasing.

I would say first, however, in reply to the conclusion of the above-quoted editorial, that not one private pension bill has up to the present time been enacted into law during this session, although a few have passed the Senate and House independently, but have not been acted upon jointly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The hour of 4 o'clock having arrived, the Clerk will read the bill by sections.

Mr. DRIGGS. I desire to ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed with my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that he be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DRIGGS. No; I have that consent, given last Friday night. I would like to ask for five minutes more time.

The CHAIRMAN. It can not be done in the committee, the order of the House being that general debate should close at 4 o'clock.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that that leave be extended to all who have participated in the debate, for ten days.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen who have participated in the debate on this bill may have leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums be, and the same are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full compensation for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, for the objects hereinafter expressed, namely:

Mr. DRIGGS. To resume, Mr. Chairman, I find, according to a most carefully prepared report of the ex-chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, Hon. GEORGE W. RAY, that in the Fifty-second Congress there were 217 special acts passed; in the Fifty-third Congress there were 119 special acts passed; in the last Congress there were 693 special acts passed.

Now, then, what is the reason for this great increase? It is not difficult of explanation. Shortly after (October 15, 1890) the enactment of the act of June 27, 1890, the following order, known as No. 164, was issued by Commissioner Raum:

ORDER NO. 164.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS.

Washington, D. C., October 15, 1890.

In regard to fixing rates of pensions under the act of June 27, 1890:

That all claimants under the act of June 27, 1890, showing a mental or physical disability or disabilities of a permanent character, not the result of their own vicious habits, and which incapacitate them from the performance of manual labor, rendering them unable to earn a support in such a degree as would be rated under former laws at or above \$6 and less than \$12, shall be rated the same as like disabilities of service origin, and that all cases showing a pensionable disability which, if of service origin, would be rated at or above \$12 per month shall be rated at \$12 per month.

GREEN B. RAUM, Commissioner.

Approved.

CYRUS BUSSEY, Assistant Secretary.

This order created, as events and time proved, an extremely liberal and generous construction of the act of June 27, 1890. It is well to remember that at the date of issuance of Order No. 164 no person in or out of public life knew anything as to the probable increase of expenditures for pensions under the law of June 27, 1890. So great, however, became the increase in the pension rolls that on June 9, 1893, Order No. 225, which follows, was issued:

ORDER NO. 225.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS.

Washington, D. C., June 9, 1893.

As to adjudicating and fixing rates of pensions under the act of June 27, 1890:

1. A claim for pension under the second section of the act of June 27, 1890, can only be allowed upon proof of mental or physical disability of a permanent character, not the result of the claimant's own vicious habits, incapacitating him for the performance of manual labor in such a degree as to render him unable to earn a support.

2. No specific injury or disability can, as such, have a pensionable rating under that act, nor be considered otherwise than as it affects the capacity of the claimant to perform ordinary manual labor.

3. Proof that the disability is not the result of the claimant's own vicious habits is requisite; and therefore the causes and circumstances of the origin of the disability should be shown by the evidence furnished in support of the claim for pension, so far as can be done, and by persons other than the claimant.

4. To give the claimant a pensionable status under this act the disability must be such as to incapacitate him for the performance of manual labor in

such a degree as to render him unable to earn a support; yet the act recognizes differences in the degree of such pensionable disability, giving \$12 per month in case of the greatest and \$6 per month in case of the lowest degree of such pensionable disability rendering the claimant unable to earn a support by manual labor. It also provides for intermediate ratings proportionate to the intermediate degrees of such pensionable disability. The proper ratings under this act will, therefore, be made in accordance with such rules for rating as the medical referee shall prescribe, subject to the approval of the Commissioner.

Approved.

WM. LOCHREN, *Commissioner*.

HOKE SMITH, *Secretary*.

This order continues in force to the present day. While Order No. 164 was too liberal, Order No. 225 was and is too severe, for it practically leaves all cases considered under its provisions to the judgment and almost absolute authority of the medical referee. It makes him almost in reality the absolute dictator of the Pension Bureau as far as the act of 1890 is concerned. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to attack the medical referee, but solely the great power given him, or, more properly speaking, his office under Order 225.

It is this order alone that has created the necessity for almost all the special bills introduced in Congress, and so long as it continues in force Congress will be flooded with special pension bills. It is un-American, because it is unjust and unfair to those of our people seeking relief at the Pension Bureau. It is a thorn in the side of every member of Congress, for it keeps us busy calling up cases that would otherwise have been speedily adjudicated at the Pension Bureau. Born in a Democratic, continued in a Republican Administration, it has been tried and found wanting. It should be modified, amended, or repealed, and some order, a fair, equitable, and just medium between it and No. 164, issued.

I respectfully submit in emphasis to the above the following decision of Assistant Secretary Davis, of the Interior Department, in the case of Charles Norbury (Senate Document No. 1, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, page 36):

Order 164 was an extremely liberal construction of the law as to rating under the act of June 27, 1890; indeed, it could not be consistently maintained when the terms of the act were compared with former laws. On the other hand, Order No. 225, as put into effect and as formerly construed, went to the other extreme, and in many cases resulted in great injustice to claimants. This was remedied in a large measure by a more liberal construction of said order, which on its face is not regarded as objectionable, properly construed, but much depends upon how it is construed. * * *

It will be observed that in the last clause of order 225 the question of rating is left largely at the discretion of the medical referee, subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Pensions.

As already indicated, much depends upon the construction given to the law and the order (225) now in force.

It should be borne in mind that the average age of the surviving soldiers who were in the war of the rebellion is 63 or upward. It is not an unreasonable presumption that nearly all are in some degree mentally or physically disabled. The spirit of the law and the circumstances attending its enactment certainly warrant the conclusion that a liberal interpretation should be given and relief granted, at least at the minimum rate, if an appreciable disability which impairs ability for self-support by manual labor is shown to exist.

The repeal of order No. 225 needs no additional or stronger argument.

Mr. Chairman, another reason for increase of special pension bills is that the laws as they now exist can be construed in any manner desired, and I quote from Commissioner Evans's personal statement when being examined by Senator GALLINGER (Senate Document No. 1, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, page 9):

Commissioner EVANS. In my annual report for 1898 I said:

"Since the passage of the general law of July 14, 1862, there have been numerous laws amendatory, special and general, with the many rulings and decisions interpreting the laws, until the whole system is a most complex and wonderful network or labyrinth of laws and legal opinions, to the end that a precedent may be cited for any action of this Bureau."

"The importance of the work is such and the demands upon the revenues of the Government so great, with a prospect of much greater in the future, that I am of the opinion that in order to secure reliable, intelligent, and uniform practice in the future a commission should be appointed on the revision of the laws, rules, and regulations governing the issuance of pensions."

That was the statement on that subject in my annual report of 1898. In my report of 1899 I add this:

"This should be done, especially to meet future conditions. With our present laws and established practice there can be no uniformity in pensioning. The beneficiaries are dissatisfied and there is general criticism."

Revision of all the pension laws has become essential, the sooner the better. Revision unquestionably will be a tremendous and expensive task; but is it not better to commence the twentieth century with a feeling of general satisfaction in the justice and fairness of the pension laws and their administration instead of a feeling of general dissatisfaction?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, am I recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be recognized in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the question of civil service was so thoroughly thrashed out in the last Congress, one year ago, that I did not suppose it was necessary to touch on it in this Congress, but the words which have been spoken by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] in regard to the new information given here yesterday requires a moment's answer. The gentleman from Ohio stated that, as reported from the

Committee on Appropriations, there were 10 per cent of inefficient employees, and he gave as the reason that the Departments did not get rid of those employees was that they did not dare to trust an application to the Civil Service Commission for new clerks, because they would get such poor ones, and they preferred to keep the old ones.

Now, if the gentleman had listened to the statement made by the Appropriations Committee yesterday, he would have heard them say that the reason these useless employees were retained was not for the reason he suggests, but was because Members of Congress and Senators went to the heads of Departments and insisted that these men, friends of theirs, should not be discharged. In other words, the system of patronage, the old system, which the gentleman says created such a model service up to 1883, that same system of patronage, of keeping friends in office, is responsible for the very retention of these useless employees to-day. And we are asked, when studying how to get rid of useless employees, to resort to the very system which retains them. If members of Congress would not exercise patronage, these men would be discharged. My colleague made the suggestion yesterday of one case where the Pension Commissioner said he would be glad to get rid of 100 men, but the members of Congress would not allow them to be discharged. In other words, it is in this case, as I think it is almost always where the civil-service system is attacked, it is attacked, not for its inherent faults, but for imperfections which the relics of the other system cause.

If in this case of decrepit employees the patronage system was done away with, we would have no trouble in getting rid of the old clerks and getting in good ones. There is one comparison we easily make right before us. It is claimed that 10 per cent of the clerks now employed are inefficient. I remember very well in the last Congress when one of the most influential members of this House, one who knows as much about the subject as anyone, said that of the employees in this House, where there is no civil service, but all are under the service which the gentleman so eulogizes, 33 per cent were unnecessary and useless, but they were employed because of the necessity of having patronage. We have here no limitations of civil service, and so just because we want the offices we create useless offices, and there are 33 per cent useless employees in this House against 10 per cent under the civil service.

Now, I want to call the attention of the gentleman to another point, which he referred to yesterday and which he repeated to-day, and where I think he is obviously mistaken. He says there is not the free right of removal, but there must be a trial and hearing, and that is one of the troubles of the service. I would like to read the rule formulated by President McKinley:

No removal shall be made from the competitive classified service except for just cause and for reasons given in writing; and the person sought to be removed shall have notice and be furnished a copy of such reasons, and be allowed a reasonable time for personally answering the same in writing.

Does that put any limitation upon the officer in regard to removal? All it requires is that the charge shall be made against the man, that he shall be removed for cause, and that he shall have an opportunity to put in his answer. But after he has put in his answer, the head of the Department may remove or not at his pleasure. It is not required that the man have any hearing. The officer is under no compulsion; he has absolute and free discretion, if he wants to discharge him. Of course the reason for that rule is obvious; it is to prevent any superior clerk, on account of petty spleen or any miserable little personalities, making false complaints and causing a removal when, if the clerk complained of had a chance to answer and the truth were known, he would keep his place, and also to prevent political removals.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the pending amendment.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Then I move to strike out the last two words.

It appears now, Mr. Chairman, that we have come to this: That we have put a farce on the records of this country—have said that no man shall be removed unless charges are preferred against him, and until he shall have a copy of those charges, and until he shall have opportunity to disprove them; but he may be removed whether those charges are true or false.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Exactly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, is not that the most monstrous position that ever was taken? Why do you require the making of charges? Why do you require a trial? The gentleman says there is no trial about it. In other words, a poor fellow may be charged with some delinquency; he comes forward and answers that the charge is not true, that he is ready to disprove it, and he does disprove it; but this does not operate in the least as a protection from the power of removal. Notwithstanding all that he may do in the way of proving his innocence of the charges, he may be turned out regardless of whether they are true or false.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman find

that limitation in the law? Does he not agree to the fact of its existence?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The plain construction of the law is that if the charges are not true the persons shall not be removed. That construction is put upon it in every Department of the Government.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman give that as his construction as a lawyer?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do most clearly. Suppose I am indicted; I have a right to see a copy of the indictment, to know what I am charged with; and if I prove myself not guilty, I have a right to go acquitted.

But let us see what else was said yesterday.

Mr. PEARRE. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Does he think it likely that the heads of the Departments and bureaus will appoint more competent men to the positions than those recommended by Members of Congress and Senators; in other words—

Mr. HEMENWAY. In reply to that, I will say that when they ask for the appointment of any particular class, they designate the kind of a man they want. If they want an accountant, they say to the gentleman, "Will you furnish me with an accountant?" and if they want an accountant you would not send them a laborer. It is the experience that Members of Congress and Senators, if given the opportunity to furnish a particular kind of man, furnish that kind.

In another place the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] says:

In reply to the gentleman's question, I can only say, with reference to this temporary force that has been employed, it is admitted by those who favor civil service and are at the heads of the different Departments that this temporary force, placed there within the last two or three years, is a very competent force; that they are more competent than the force secured through the civil service. They are younger men, men better qualified for the particular service to which they are assigned, and all along the line more efficient than the force secured through the civil service.

There is a testimony that every chief of division in this great city who knows about it will make, I think, whenever the gentleman from Massachusetts wants to get the information—that that great body of clerks who did the great business of this Government, who handled the great service of the Government during the extraordinary demands of the Spanish and the Philippine war; that the service of that force has been more efficient than anything ever obtained under civil-service procedure in this country.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Do I understand that the statement just made by the gentleman from Ohio is signed by every head of a Department?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I say that it will be verified by every bureau chief.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. The statement just read—by whom is that statement made?

Mr. GROSVENOR. By the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] in charge of this bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Then it is not the statement of any chief of a bureau.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I said that it would be confirmed by every bureau chief in the city who had these men in his division.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. How do you know that?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I know it from constant, everyday contact with those gentlemen.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman know that the efficiency of the Railway Mail Service has increased tremendously within the last ten years since that service was protected by civil-service regulations?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have no doubt about that.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. That service is better now than it ever was.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It is better now than it ever was; and have I not always voted to retain this system in that branch of the service?

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Then you are talking about something else not now under discussion.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman pardon me a moment?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman is occupying my time.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. But the gentleman was arguing that the service of clerks appointed without reference to civil-service requirements was better than the service of clerks appointed under civil-service regulations. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am stating what the record shows; and the testimony of every bureau chief in this city will back me up.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. That testimony is not here.

Mr. GROSVENOR. This testimony is here, coming from a member of this House who has this bill in charge and who says it is the testimony of these men who know.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Was it given before any committee?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Does the gentleman know any better testimony than this?

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I want straighter testimony than the best which the gentleman seems to be able to give.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I read the statement of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY].

Mr. HEMENWAY. Will the gentleman allow me a word? We had before us Capt. C. H. Davis, of the Naval Observatory, who called attention to the fact that he had recently sent to the Civil Service Commission for an engineer, and they sent him a Methodist parson and a negro at that. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Exactly. A happy illustration of this whole thing, and I thank the gentleman for the information.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DRIGGS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DRIGGS] is recognized in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. DRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, another reason for the increase of special pension bills is the ever-increasing misunderstanding between the medical referee and the local boards of medical examiners.

I would like to add right here that in the report of Senator GALLINGER in response to a question asked the Commissioner of Pensions by the Senator, twice repeated, so that there could be no misunderstanding, as to the desirability of omitting from future appropriation bills the provision that the ratings made by the medical board shall be considered by the Bureau in reaching conclusions, he replied that he was emphatically in favor of omitting these ratings. Mr. Chairman, these medical boards come from all of our districts. Many of them are made up of the best physicians that can be found in our localities.

Mr. SIMS. You mean the local boards?

Mr. DRIGGS. I mean the local boards, for I judge Commissioner Evans so meant. I say the local boards have the very best physicians throughout the district. The soldier appears before them, and yet the medical referee in this year's report of the Commissioner of Pensions, says that there are but very few of these boards who are able to draw an adequate pen picture as to the disabilities of the soldiers who have appeared before them. I contend that the local medical boards are far more able and competent to judge of the disabilities of the soldiers and sailors, of men entitled to a pension, than some man in the Pension Bureau who acts as a sort of referee on that case. They are the most peculiar kind of referees I ever saw or heard of. They know nothing whatever about the applicant except from the evidence which is put before them, never having seen the soldier at all, and surely the physicians who personally examined the applicant for pension are far more capable of judging the disabilities than a physician not having had an actual eye study of the case.

I contend that the local boards are as careful in their examinations as are the examiners in the division of the medical referee. Why, sir, in hundreds of cases considered by our committee during the past three years we have found local board upon local board agreeing upon various disabilities and their reports afterwards rejected by the division of the medical referee. In nine cases out of ten we would overrule the referee and allow the claim, accepting the testimony of the local board as conclusive on the questions raised.

I do not believe such language as the following, taken from page 94 of the Report of the Commissioner of Pensions for 1899, is justifiable, viz:

It is the experience of the medical examiners and reviewers of the division that too many boards have very little appreciation of their duties and very little regard for the interest of either the claimant or the Government. It is too much a question with them of the number of examinations they make and the amount of fees that may be coming to them at the end of a quarter. The whole system of employment of the members of the boards of examining surgeons is faulty in this, that it fails to guarantee the best talent for these places. And so long as influence shall alone determine who shall be appointed, the Bureau will fail to secure the best results.

This is part of report of medical referee.

I do not believe local boards are infallible, but I do believe their errors are no more numerous than those of the division of the medical referee. I desire to cite one case, and others could be shown had I the time. The case referred to is from Senate Document No. 1, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, page 37, to wit, the witness before the committee a Mr. Patrick:

But the second case was that of Born, to which I have referred. The medical examination in that case showed that this applicant was disabled to the extent of 50 per cent in the use of his right shoulder from crepitus, and the disability was rated by the examiner at nine-eighths. He was also reported as suffering from hemorrhoids and similar troubles, for which the medical board had rated him at six-eighths disability. For some other infirmities that I do not recall he was rated as having been disabled to the extent of six-thirtieths. This claim had been rejected, and it seemed to our unprofessional view that it should have been allowed had the disabilities been properly combined.

At our request the medical referee was sent for, and he came in and we discussed at considerable length the first disability which he thought did not establish a pensionable status. But when we passed to the second he very promptly stated that when combining the effects of the first and second disabilities, and taking into consideration perhaps also the third, the application ought to have been allowed. He also stated that two months prior to that time he had placed a competent and careful member of his staff in charge of

such cases to overlook them after they had been passed upon by the medical examiners in his office, so as to see that no injustice had been or might be done, and that every case in which the disabilities ought to have been combined should be so rated, because these small cases did not come personally before the medical referee. He stated that this particular case had been adjudicated during the temporary absence of the official whom he had so placed in charge; and I think that he expressed the opinion that but for such absence that claim would doubtless have been allowed.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in fair play, and also in the theory that there are two sides to every question. I therefore quote each of the above. I contend that in the Pension Bureau at the small salaries paid it is an absolute impossibility to obtain the best medical talent for the examination or review of cases or for the pen pictures or portrayal of the cases, and the best examinations are those made by the local boards and not by the Pension Bureau. And so long as influence shall alone determine who shall be appointed in the division of medical referee in Washington in the Pension Bureau the Bureau will fail to secure the best results.

Mr. SIMS. I understand the gentleman to say that the best medical talent is found on the local boards.

Mr. DRIGGS. Yes, I do say so.

Mr. SIMS. Now, in your city of New York can the best medical talent be obtained to work for \$10 a day?

Mr. DRIGGS. By no means.

Mr. SIMS. That is all they can get on a local board.

Mr. DRIGGS. I am aware of that.

Mr. SIMS. But they can not get more than \$10 a day, because if they examine more than five cases they do not get paid for it.

Mr. DRIGGS. That is the case. But they have their own private practice; they are largely not political appointees; they are all good physicians and surgeons; certainly 90 per cent of them are. I believe that a very decided reform or even a revolution of the methods of examination now in vogue in the divisions of medical examination (referee and local board alike) would be productive of very beneficial results to the pensioner, to the country, and to the Treasury of the United States.

From all the above argument taken collectively I have endeavored to show how and why a committee of Congress can pass upon a pension claim as fairly, honestly, and wisely as the trained experts of the Pension Bureau.

The pension question has ever attracted the attention of our Republic. Many debates have occurred in Congress upon the subject, and thousands of columns have been printed in the *Annals*, *Globe*, and *RECORD* recording for all time these debates. Why, sir, in 1820 the agitation was so great that Congress passed the famous "alarm act," which provided that "every pensioner shall exhibit a schedule of his whole estate and income, clothing and bedding excepted."

In 1830-1835 more discussion; 1850-1855 more agitation; so it has continued to the present day. How much have we paid out for pensions?

It is impossible for me to deal with more than our four great wars while considering amount of pensions paid.

I. REVOLUTIONARY WAR.

In all 278,000 soldiers served during the struggle for freedom. Of this number 37,918 received pensions amounting to \$49,000,000, and to this day we see from the following table that some of their descendants are on the list. (Pension Commissioner's Report 1899, page 61.)

Names of surviving widows and daughters of Revolutionary soldiers on the pension rolls June 30, 1899, with their ages and places of residence.

Name.	Age.	Name of soldier.	Service.	Town and State.
Barrett, Hannah Newell.*	99	Harrod, Noah	Massachusetts	Boston, Mass.
Chadwick, Susanah.*	84	Chadwick, Elihu	New Jersey	Emporium, Pa.
Damon, Esther S.	85	Damon, Noah	Massachusetts	Plymouth Union, Vt.
Hurlburt, Sarah C.*	81	Weeks, Elijah	do	Little Marsh, Pa.
Jones, Nancy	85	Darling, James	N. Carolina	Jonesboro, Tenn.
Mayo, Rebecca	86	Mayo, Stephen	Virginia	Newbern, Va.
Sandford, Eliza*	89	Sandford, Wm	United States	Bloomfield, N. J.
Slaughter, Ann M.*	89	Slaughter, Philip	Virginia	Mitchell Station, Va.
Snead, Mary	83	Snead, Bowdoin	do	Parkley, Va.
Thompson, Rhoda Augusta.*	78	Thompson, Thad.	New York	Woodbury, Conn.
Tuller, Augusta*		Way, Isaac	Connecticut	Bridgeport, Conn.

* Daughter; pensioned by special act.

Hiram Cronk, who served with the troops from New York, is the only surviving pensioned soldier of the war of 1812. He is 99 years of age, and resides in northwestern New York.

Daniel F. Bakeman, the last survivor of the war of the Revolution, was born in Schoharie County, N. Y., September 28, 1759; died in Freedom, Cattaraugus County, N. Y., April 5, 1869, aged 109 years 6 months and 8 days.

To the widows of the Revolution were paid about \$20,000,000, making a total of \$69,000,000.

II. WAR OF 1812.

Total enlistments were 527,654. Of this number 296,916 served sixty days or more, and 31,000 of them have been pensioned, and 35,000 widows have been pensioned.

III. MEXICAN WAR.

Total enlistments were 73,260. Of this number 7,560 were pensioned as invalids prior to the act of January 29, 1887. Since the passage of that act I have been unable to find any statistics showing greatest number of pensioners on account of Mexican war, but as the number of surviving pensioners is 17,379, the percentage of pensioners to enlistments must have been very great. Taking the total number of pensioners in the Mexican war, viz, 32,000, the percentage would be over 43 per cent of the enlistments. The expenditure in money, or total disbursements, is shown in the following table (page 52, Report Pension Commissioner, 1899):

WAR OF 1812.

Fiscal year.	Survivors.	Widows.	Total disbursements.
1871 (from Feb. 14, 1871).....	\$2,555.05	\$511.00	\$3,066.05
1872.....	1,977,415.84	335,993.63	2,313,409.47
1873.....	2,078,606.98	689,303.59	2,767,910.57
1874.....	1,588,832.95	616,016.40	2,204,849.35
1875.....	1,355,509.86	533,000.21	1,888,509.07
1876.....	1,089,037.18	445,772.95	1,534,810.13
1877.....	934,657.82	361,548.91	1,296,206.73
1878 (from Mar. 9, 1878).....	768,918.47	294,572.05	1,063,490.52
1879.....	1,014,525.66	2,102,699.54	3,207,225.20
1880.....	790,710.39	2,658,058.14	3,448,768.53
1881.....	621,612.80	2,381,800.95	3,003,413.75
1882.....	478,274.85	2,024,207.63	2,502,482.48
1883.....	337,334.81	1,882,542.41	2,239,877.22
1884.....	278,888.85	1,686,302.09	1,965,190.94
1885.....	207,782.80	1,518,202.39	1,725,985.19
1886.....	144,389.59	1,458,896.44	1,603,286.03
1887.....	105,837.01	1,765,582.36	1,871,419.37
1888.....	73,659.48	1,596,604.96	1,670,264.44
1889.....	52,800.27	1,397,487.09	1,450,287.36
1890.....	38,847.09	1,263,239.37	1,302,086.46
1891.....	22,504.64	1,040,284.41	1,062,789.05
1892.....	11,908.93	827,080.53	838,989.46
1893.....	10,494.27	721,060.32	731,554.59
1894.....	5,312.20	645,297.46	650,609.66
1895.....	3,583.27	541,923.48	545,506.75
1896.....	1,972.27	456,847.61	458,819.88
1897.....	1,440.00	388,291.95	389,731.95
1898.....	791.06	347,070.15	347,861.21
1899.....	193.33	293,097.48	293,290.81
Total.....	14,018,487.72	30,363,295.50	44,381,783.22

WAR WITH MEXICO.

1887.....	\$53,148.68	\$2,458.08	\$55,606.76
1888.....	1,861,756.07	583,066.28	2,444,812.35
1889.....	1,796,899.30	693,572.45	2,490,471.75
1890.....	1,728,027.54	695,054.90	2,423,082.44
1891.....	1,622,114.75	695,314.52	2,317,429.27
1892.....	1,425,258.18	686,733.57	2,111,991.75
1893.....	1,396,392.88	736,173.41	2,132,566.29
1894.....	1,388,707.07	803,345.91	2,192,052.98
1895.....	1,433,096.86	802,032.96	2,235,129.82
1896.....	1,508,685.95	814,096.14	2,322,782.09
1897.....	1,279,188.31	818,593.78	2,097,782.09
1898.....	1,213,508.63	846,560.26	2,060,068.89
1899.....	1,107,594.63	818,067.58	1,925,662.21
Total.....	17,674,972.35	8,995,029.84	26,670,002.19

IV. CIVIL WAR.

Total enlistments, 2,778,304; died in battle or of wounds, 349,944. On account of the tremendous magnitude of the civil war the pension disbursements resulting from that war have been enormous, amounting to over \$2,300,000,000 since 1865, while the number of pensioners on the roll to-day is 991,519 (there were only 13,000 on the roll in 1850). Collectively there have been 2,271,705 claims filed, 1,616,391 allowed, leaving 655,314 rejected. Deducting 991,519 from 1,616,391, we find over 625,000 of those pensioned have passed over the dark river.

The following table shows number and class of pensions pending June 30, 1899:

<i>Number of claims pending under the acts of July 14, 1862, and March 3, 1873.</i>			
Original invalid.....	26,468		
Reissue invalid.....	53,610		
Increase invalid.....	102,904		
Original widows.....	28,113		
Reissue widows.....	11,471		
Increase widows.....	642		
		40,226	
			220,208
<i>Number of claims pending under the act of June 27, 1890.</i>			
Original invalid.....	59,739		
Additional invalid.....	29,534		
Increase invalid.....	83,903		
		173,176	
Original widows.....	38,740		
			211,916

War with Spain:	
Original invalid.....	14,905
Increase invalid.....	14
Original widows.....	2,416
Army nurses.....	17,335
Service prior to March 4, 1861.....	2,453
Accrued.....	22,059
Total.....	477,239

While this seems a great number, the decreases have exceeded the increases, as shown by the following table:

NET DECREASES.	
War 1812, survivors.....	2
War 1812, widows.....	409
Mexican war, survivors.....	808
Indian war, survivors.....	363
Indian war, widows.....	168
General law:	
Army invalids.....	10,246
Army widows.....	1,949
Army nurses.....	2
Navy invalids.....	112
Navy widows.....	7
Total.....	14,066

NET INCREASES.	
Act June 27, 1890:	
Army invalids.....	6,621
Army widows.....	4,342
Navy invalids.....	352
Navy widows.....	195
War with Mexico:	
Widows.....	32
War with Spain:	
Army invalids.....	117
Army widows.....	165
Navy invalids.....	6
Navy widows.....	11
Total.....	11,871

While the decrease is only 2,195, it is nevertheless a decrease, and I believe we have, notwithstanding our Spanish and Philippine war claims, passed high-water mark and are now on the ebb tide. I believe, too, from figures and from the average life of man, that in 1915 the pension roll, as it now is formed and exists, will amount to less than \$80,000,000 per annum.

Many people think the nation's pension roll is heavy with fraud. Strange, indeed, would it be were there not some fraud; but, all in all, I believe that that roll is honest and almost without reproach. Take, if you please, and consider this report of criminal cases in the various Departments of the Government—possibly you have not noticed the last annual report of the Attorney-General. If not, get one, and look at the subhead "Criminal prosecutions," which shows convictions, acquittals, etc., on account of violation of different laws, as follows:

	Convictions.	Acquittals.	Nol. pros., etc.
Internal-revenue laws.....	4,021	825	1,698
Post-office laws.....	770	92	344
Customs laws.....	136	21	59
Pension laws.....	109	17	88

Of the prosecutions still pending July 1, 1899, 4,889 were for violation of internal-revenue laws, 755 post-office laws, 112 customs laws, and 196 pension laws.

It occurs to me that there is food for thought in the foregoing, in view of the fact that in the papers in Washington, surely, and, so far as I have observed, in the metropolitan press everywhere, there has been but little notice of the frauds, indictments, and prosecutions generally going on throughout the country except those relating to pensions. These have been regularly ground out from day to day and week to week, as you have doubtless all noticed.

I freely confess that before my election as Representative to Congress I believed in the "pension-fraud" cry. Since my admittance to this House my views have entirely changed, for such reports as those of the Attorney-General are bound to appeal to any fair-minded person. I believe the pension roll is in many, many ways a roll of honor, and one to be respected and not universally condemned. The cases of suffering relieved are many; the cases of fraud few.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I realize that pension payments have been almost inconceivably stupendous, but the service performed has been equally great. Had it not been for the soldiers of the Revolution, we would have had no Republic; had it not been for the soldiers and sailors of 1812, we would not be to-day free upon the high seas; had it not been for the soldiers of the Mexican war, we would not have remained the great North American power; had it not been for the boys in blue of 1861-1865, we would have been a disunited Union, while the soldiers and sailors of 1898 established us firmly as a world power.

The pension roll has increased during the past seven years more largely from the fact that the soldiers of the 1861-1865 struggle, through advancing age, are less able to earn their daily sustenance by manual labor. In their days of strong young and middle manhood, when each succeeding day dawned upon continued ambition for old-age competency, their thoughts dwelt not upon pensions, but upon work. Old age has now overtaken many of them; the struggle for competency has not been poured into their coffers by Dame Fortune, and at last their thoughts have turned to Uncle Sam to make their declining years easier and a trifle happier.

Pensions are not a question of dollars alone. To carry out the letter and spirit of the pension laws should be one of the objects in their administration. Fairness, based on justice, ought to actuate the Interior Department in their execution. No worthy case should be passed over as unworthy; neither under any circumstances should an unworthy applicant be given consideration. There should be no petty quibbling and hairsplitting over minor details of no material importance, causing delay, annoyance, and bitterness.

If the case is just, grant it; if unjust, reject it. Through lapse of years, the death of comrades, or a weakened mental or physical condition the applicant for pension frequently finds it impossible to furnish all the proof required by the Department and his claim is rejected. Construe the laws fairly for the benefit of the soldier and the United States alike and no one complains; construe them differently and press, people, and soldier shout aloud their denunciation of the pension laws. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the formal amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SENATE.

For compensation of Senators, \$450,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD] is recognized for five minutes on the pro forma amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I wish to say a word regarding the statement which was made here a moment ago, coming from the gentleman in charge of the bill before the House [Mr. HEMENWAY], regarding the certification of persons for different positions in the United States Government.

I have never heard of any such experience as the gentleman has related, and I do not think any such thing has occurred in our section of the country. He stated that a head of Department asked for an engineer, and a Methodist minister—and a negro, at that—was certified. I can not understand how any gentleman who may be a Methodist preacher could pass an examination as an engineer if the examination for engineer in the particular section of country that this gentleman came from is of the same sort as is required in the New England States. I am a firm believer in the civil-service law as far as this law applies to positions above the grade of mechanics and laborers.

As I stated a few moments ago, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the statements made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], I have seen it repeatedly stated in the public press and in the reports of the Post-Office Department that the efficiency of the Railway Mail Service has increased greatly since this department came under the civil-service law; a very small fraction of 1 per cent of mistakes are made by the clerks employed in that service compared to the large percentage of mistakes that were made before the operation of a civil-service law. I wish at this time to indicate to the members of this House how the civil-service law is carried on for positions in the United States Government departments in the city of Boston.

In the post-office department there every man who takes an examination for a position in the post-office, whether it is for the position of letter carrier or clerk or for any other position, is given his appointment in the order of the percentage that he receives.

Beginning with the administration of General Corse, under Mr. Cleveland when he served his first term, the man who passed the best examination for letter carrier and clerk was appointed.

There is a list exposed in the post-office, and if five men, for instance, have been appointed within the last few months, it will be found that the names of those five men are the names of those who are first on the list. It is the same way in the matter of the appointment of clerks. The same practice was followed by the gentleman who succeeded General Corse, Hon. Thomas M. Hart, who is now the mayor of Boston.

His course was followed by the Democratic postmaster who succeeded him, and he in turn by the Republican postmaster, so that in the appointments in the Boston post-office service—and I think the same thing obtains in the Boston custom-house—the poor boy has as much chance as the boy with political influence, if he shows

from his examination his capacity and his ability to meet the requirements of the position.

I think this condition of affairs reflects the sentiments of the people of our section of the country on this question, as the different postmasters in taking this action felt undoubtedly that the people of Boston demanded that the civil-service law should be enforced in letter as well as in spirit.

Mr. Chairman, I say that I believe in that practice. In these days, when trusts are getting control of private businesses and thousands of men are thrown out of employment, it is a gratifying, and, I say, a wise arrangement, and a necessary and proper precaution, that the Government takes in giving out and apportioning the places within its gift to exact a civil-service examination for the place.

It is proper to exact an educational test and then appoint the men in the order of their merit and fitness for the position as shown in their examination.

In this way the boy and girl who, through the advantage they obtain in the great public-school systems of our country, become proficient in education and learning and fit themselves for positions of trust and responsibility in the Government service are enabled to secure positions on fitness and merit rather than through favoritism or political consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY.

For expenses of compiling, preparing, and indexing the Congressional Directory, to be expended under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, \$1,200.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 10, line 20, after the word "the," insert the word "present."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Under Architect of the Capitol: For chief engineer, \$1,700; 2 assistant engineers, at \$1,200 each; 4 conductors of elevators, at \$1,100 each, who shall be under the supervision and direction of the Architect of the Capitol; laborer, \$320; 5 firemen, at \$900 each; electrician, \$1,200; laborer, \$1,000; laborer to clean Statuary Hall and watch statuary therein, \$600; in all, \$16,680.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 12 and offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to return to page 12. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 12, after the word "each," in line 6, insert: "Document and bill clerk under resolution of February 2, 1900, \$1,600;" and in line 18 strike out "eighty-six thousand seven" and insert "eighty-eight thousand three."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerks and messengers to committees: For clerk to the Committee on Ways and Means, \$3,600; assistant clerk, \$1,600; messenger, \$1,200; janitor, \$720; clerk to the Committee on Appropriations, \$3,000; assistant clerk and stenographer, \$2,000; messenger and assistant clerk, \$1,200; clerks to Committees on Accounts, Agriculture, Banking and Currency, Claims, District of Columbia, Elections, Foreign Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Indian Affairs, Invalid Pensions, Judiciary, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, Post-Office and Post-Roads, Public Buildings and Grounds, Public Lands, Rivers and Harbors, War Claims, and clerk to continue Digest of Claims under resolution of March 7, 1888, at \$2,000 each; and for assistant clerk to the Committee on War Claims, \$1,200; in all, \$53,920.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I offer the following amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 13, at the end of line 19, insert "pensions;" and in line 24 strike out "fifty-three" and insert "fifty-five."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For 18 clerks to committees at \$6 each per day during the session, \$13,068.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 13, line 25, strike out "eighteen" and insert in lieu thereof "seventeen;" and on page 14, in line 1, strike out "\$13,068" and insert "\$13,342."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For furniture, including partitions, screens, and shelving, \$30,000.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 8347 and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. GAMBLE, for three days, on account of important business.

To Mr. WHITE, for Friday and Saturday, on account of important business.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The Committee on War Claims was discharged from the consideration of Executive Document No. 432, being letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting communications from certain officials of the Treasury relating to claims of employees for work done overtime during the war with Spain, and the same was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—PEARSON AGAINST CRAWFORD.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the resolution that was adopted at the time of filing the majority report in the matter of the contested-election case of Pearson against Crawford, giving the minority of the committee ten days within which to file their views, I desire to file the views of the minority, and ask that they be printed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana submits the following privileged report, pursuant to order of the House, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Case of Pearson against Crawford.

The SPEAKER. The views of the minority will be ordered printed and referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Paymaster-General and draft of a bill relating to relief of Paymaster F. S. Dodge—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the estates of American citizens dying abroad—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SHELDEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7740) to amend section 8 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the Fort Smith and Western Railroad Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw and Creek nations, in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 337); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FLYNN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2931) to provide for submitting to the Court of Claims for determination the rights of the Delaware Indians in the Cherokee Nation, the Mississippi Choctaws in the Choctaw Nation, the Chickasaw freedmen in the Chickasaw Nation, and intermarried persons in the Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Cherokee nations, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 340); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred House bills 5024 and 905, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 8590) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Comanche, Kiowa, and Apache tribes of Indians in Oklahoma Territory, and to open their reservations for settlement, accompanied by a report (No. 342); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOLLIVER, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred House bill 4727, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 8620) amendatory of sections 3339 and 3341 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to internal-revenue tax on fermented liquors, accompanied by a report (No. 343); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7322) granting an increase of pension to Frederick E. Vance, of Clay Center, Kans., late of Company A, First Minnesota Cavalry, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 341); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WATERS: A bill (H. R. 8585) to amend chapter 313 of the United States Statutes at Large, entitled "An act to prevent forest fires on the public domain"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 8586) for the erection of a public building at Lawrenceburg, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LATIMER (by request): A bill (H. R. 8587) to abolish the office of register of wills, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 8588) for the extension of Eighth street NE. (West Railroad avenue, Brookland, D. C.)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 8589) giving the Secretary of the Interior discretionary power to extend the time for making final proof in desert-land entries—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs: A bill (H. R. 8590) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Comanche, Kiowa, and Apache tribes of Indians in Oklahoma Territory, and to open their reservation for settlement—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. DOLLIVER, from the Committee on Ways and Means: A bill (H. R. 8620) amendatory of sections 3339 and 3341 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to internal-revenue tax on fermented liquors—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. DE VRIES: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 175) providing for the authorization of the Secretary of War to purchase lands necessary for and to proceed with the works recommended by the California Débris Commission—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KLUTTZ: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 176) to amend the Constitution of the United States relating to direct taxes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 18) providing for a preliminary survey for a canal from Puget Sound to Grays Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky: A resolution (H. Res. 149) calling on the Secretary of State for certain information—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A resolution (H. Res. 150) relating to accounts in the War Department—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 151) relating to accounts in the Treasury Department—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LESTER: A resolution (H. Res. 153) for examination of Savannah Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 8591) for the relief of the estate of Raphael Segura, deceased, late of Iberia Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 8592) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Fields—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER: A bill (H. R. 8593) for the relief of the heirs of C. C. Spaulding, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 8594) granting a pension to Matilda Rapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROSIUS: A bill (H. R. 8595) for the relief of the legal owners of the Columbia Bridge, at Columbia, Pa.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELLAMY: A bill (H. R. 8596) to appropriate \$10,000 to inclose and beautify the grounds and repair the monument on the Moores Creek battlefield, North Carolina—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CARMACK: A bill (H. R. 8597) for the relief of Patrick G. Meath—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 8598) for the relief of Eugenia M. Allen, née Rossman—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8599) granting a pension to Ellen J. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMP: A bill (H. R. 8600) granting a pension to Edward S. Dickinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 8601) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Protestant Church of Middleway, Jefferson County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT (by request): A bill (H. R. 8602) for the relief of Theophilus Fisk Mills—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 8603) authorizing the Secretary of War to place upon the retired list of the Army Sergt. Patrick S. Cleary—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLEMING: A bill (H. R. 8604) for the relief of Eli Fraser, of Wilkinson County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HEDGE: A bill (H. R. 8605) granting a pension to Joseph Champlin Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 8606) for the relief of the estate of Jesse Mabry, deceased, late of Rankin County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 8607) granting an increase of pension to Chaney J. Poore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8608) for the relief of David A. Cornell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8609) granting bounty to William H. Southwell—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 8610) granting a pension of \$50 per month to Abner S. Crawford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 8611) for the relief of Joseph S. Gillon—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 8612) for the relief of Mary A. Bell, of Emanuel County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8613) for the relief of the Chatham Artillery—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 8614) to muster Franklin V. Ayres—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8615) granting a pension to Ettie E. House—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NAPHEN: A bill (H. R. 8616) to place on the pension roll the name of Mrs. L. L. Johnson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: A bill (H. R. 8617) granting a pension to James W. Wick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TERRY (by request): A bill (H. R. 8618) granting a pension to Clarence E. Haney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 8619) granting a pension to James B. Mahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 8621) granting an increase of pension to Beckwith A. McNemar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEREA (by request): A bill (H. R. 8622) for the payment to Bart. A. Nymeyer of the balance due him for surveying public lands—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 8623) granting a pension to Florence Tate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 8624) for the relief of Frank Gammon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Letter of the secretary of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, in relation to the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Petition of George D. Case and other druggists, of Milledgeville, Ga., for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the National Building Trades Council of America, against the passage of the bill prohibiting ticket brokerage—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELL: Resolution of the National Live Stock Association, held at Fort Worth, Tex., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 3988, to reorganize the Weather Bureau—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, Boulder Branch, No. 642, Letter Carriers' National Association, favoring the passage of House bill No. 4911, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BELLAMY: Petition of J. B. Mercer, D. L. Gove, and

other citizens of Brunswick and New Hanover counties, N. C., including the Chamber of Commerce and Produce Exchange of Wilmington, N. C., for an appropriation for the improvement of Lockwoods Folly River, North Carolina, to accompany joint resolution No. 12—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Petition of R. P. Kelley, of Eureka, Kans., asking that the Government continue the manufacture and distribution of blackleg vaccine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Remonstrance of John P. Tenold and other citizens of Flandreau, S. Dak., against the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: Papers to accompany House bill relating to the claim of Eugenia M. Allen—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Papers to accompany House bill No. 8816, granting a pension to Harry E. Fillmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Resolution of McPherson Post, No. 33, Department of Iowa, Grand Army of the Republic, for the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: Papers to accompany House bill No. 1782, for the relief of D. B. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, affidavits of Dr. J. W. Ramsey and others, to accompany House bill to increase the pension of Beckwith A. McNemar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolutions of Racine (Wis.) Trades and Labor Council, protesting against the passage of House bill No. 5067, concerning the boarding of vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GAMBLE: Petition of John P. Tenold and other citizens of Flandreau, S. Dak., protesting against the passage of the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KNOX: Paper to accompany House bill relating to the claim of Joseph S. Gillow—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolution of General Hancock Post, No. 22, Department of Iowa, Grand Army of the Republic, urging the passage of House bill No. 2583, giving veterans preference in employment—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. LATIMER: Resolution of the Young Men's Business League of Charleston, S. C., in favor of an amendment to the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEEKISON: Papers to accompany House bill No. 7704, granting a pension to Maggie M. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERCER: Resolution of the Farmers' Institute of Nebraska, protesting against any change in the present tariff law with regard to products of Puerto Rico and other tropical islands—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Paper to accompany House bill No. 4673, for the relief of Josiah Standley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 7170, granting a pension to Samuel Setzer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVILLE: Papers to accompany House bill No. 4827, granting a pension to Emily M. Gillespie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: Papers to accompany House bill No. 7794, in the matter of granting a pension to John Conter, of Tiffin, Ohio—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of Elwood, Ind., in relation to the reclamation and settlement of public land—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: Papers to accompany House bill No. 5938, granting a pension to James W. Wick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPALDING: Petition of the Congregational Church of Oriska, N. Dak., for the passage of a bill limiting absolute divorce in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Hans L. Ugland and 184 other citizens of the State of North Dakota, in favor of the Pettigrew amendment to the homestead law—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolutions of the State prison directors of Connecticut, against the bills restricting or forbidding the interstate transportation of prison-made products—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. TERRY: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to James B. Mahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Clarence E. Haney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of Louis F. Haffen and other citizens of New York, to authorize the Secretary of War to contract with Charles Stoughton for the construction of the Harlem Kills Canal, etc.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Link-Belt Engineering Company, of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of Senate bill No. 1159, for improved facilities in the Patent Office—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of Schandain & Lind, Philadelphia, Pa., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumery, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John Rhoads Company, in relation to the revenue tax on warehouse receipts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Dorsey Printing Company, of Dallas, Tex., for the improvement of Trinity River from the Gulf of Mexico to the city of Dallas, Tex.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the Firemen's Association of the State of Pennsylvania, opposing the passage of Senate bill No. 1743, establishing a division for the regulation of insurance among the several States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 16, 1900.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. FAIRBANKS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

PUBLIC RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES IN CUBA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 17th ultimo, a statement showing the receipts from customs, postal service, internal revenue, and miscellaneous sources from the date of the occupation of Cuba by the military forces of the Government, January 1, 1899, to December 31, 1899, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba, and ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. HALE. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

Mr. NELSON. I hope that motion will not be adopted. We have so many important matters that we ought to be in session to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not open to debate. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4006) to authorize the Union Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (H. R. 5288) relating to lights on steam pilot vessels; and
A bill (H. R. 7739) to amend an act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1899.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Wednesday next, immediately after the routine morning business, I shall ask the leave of the Senate to submit some remarks upon the various bills and resolutions relating to the Philippine Islands.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FOSTER presented a petition of the Sunday school of the First Christian Church, of Olympia, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquor in the Hawaiian Islands; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

He also presented the petition of Mrs. Homer Hill, president, and Miss M. E. Pike, secretary, on behalf of the Woman Suffrage Association of Washington, praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the disfranchisement of United States citizens on account of sex, and remonstrating against the insertion of the word "male" in the